THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXIX.—JANUARY, 1904—No. 113.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI DIVINA PROVIDENTIA

PII PAPAE X.

EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA.

AD PATRIARCHAS, PRIMATES, ARCHIEPISCOPOS, EPISCOPOS, ALIOSQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIOS PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES.

Venerabilibus Fratribus, Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiscopis, Episcopis Aliisque Locorum Ordinariis Pacem et Communionem cum Apostolica Sede Habentibus.

PIUS PP. X.

VENERABILES FRATRES

Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

E SUPREMI apostolatus cathedra, ad quam, consilio Dei inscrutabili, evecti fuimus, vobis primum eloquuturos, nihil attinet commemorare quibus Nos lacrymis magnisque precibus formidolosum hoc Pontificatus onus depellere a Nobis conati simus. Videmur equidem Nobis, etsi omnino meritis impares, convertere in rem Nostram posse quae Anselmus, vir sanctissimus,

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1903, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

querebatur quum, adversans et repugnans, coactus est honorem episcopatus suscipere. Etenim quae ille moeroris indicia pro se afferebat, eadem et Nobis proferre licet, ut ostendamus quo animo, qua voluntate Christi gregis pascendi gravissimum officii munus exceperimus. "Testantur," sic ille (Epp. i., 3, ep. i.), "lacrymae meae et voces et rugitus a gemitu cordis mei, quales nunquam de me, ullo dolore, memini exiisse ante diem illam, in qua sors illa gravis archiepiscopatus Cantuariae visa est super me cedidisse. Quod ignorare nequiverunt illi qui, ea die, vultum meum inspexerunt. . . . Ego magis mortuo quam viventi colore similis, stupore et dolore pallebam. Huic autem de me electioni, imo violentiae, hactenus, quantum potui, servata veritate, reluctatus sum. Sed iam, velim nolim, cogor fateri quia quotidie iudicia Dei magis ac magis conatui meo resistunt, ut nullo modo videam me ea posse fugere. Unde iam, non tam hominum quam Dei, contra quam non est prudentia, victus violentiâ, hoc solo intelligo me uti debere consilio, ut, postquam oravi quantum potui, et conatus sum ut, si possibile esset, calix iste transiret a me ne biberem illum . . . meum sensum et voluntatem postponens, me sensui et voluntati Dei penitus committam."

Nec plane repugnandi causae, multae, et maximae, defuerunt Nobis. Praeterquam enim quod honore pontificatus, ob tenuitatem Nostram, nullo pacto Nos dignaremur; quem non moveret ei se successorem designari, qui, cum ecclesiam sex fere ac viginti annos sapientissime rexisset, tanta valuit alacritate ingenii, tanto virtutum omnium splendore, ut vel adversarios in sui admirationem traduxerit et memoriam sui nominis factis praeclarissimis consecrarit?—Dein, ut praetereamus cetera, terrebat Nos, quam quod maxime, ea quae modo est humani generis conditio afflictissima. Quem enim lateat, consociationem hominum gravissimo nunc, supra praeteritas aetates, atque intimo urgeri morbo; qui in dies ingravescens eamque penitus exedens ad exitium rapit? Morbus qui sit, intelligitis, Venerabiles Fratres; defectio abscessioque a Deo: quo nihil profecto cum pernicie coniunctius, secundum Prophetae dictum: "Quia ecce, qui elongant se a te, peribunt." (Ps. lxxii., 27.) Tanto igitur malo, pro pontificali munere quod demandabatur, occurrendum esse Nobis videbamus; arbitrabamur enim Dei iussum ad Nos pertinere: "Ecce constitui te hodie super gentes et super regna, ut evellas et destruas, et aedifices et plantes" (Ierem. i., 10); verum conscii Nobis infirmitatis Nostrae, negotium, quod nihil simul haberet morae et difficultatis plurimum, suscipere verebamur.

Attamen, quoniam numini divino placuit humilitatem Nostram ad hanc amplitudinem potestatis provehere; erigimus animum in eo qui Nos confortat, Deique virtute freti manum operi admoventes,

in gerendo pontificatu hoc unum declaramus propositum esse Nobis "instaurare omnia in Christo" (Ephes. i., 10), ut videlicet sit "omnia et in omnibus Christus" (Coloss. iii., 11).—Erunt profecto qui, divina humanis metientes, quae Nostra sit animi mens rimari nitantur atque ad terrenos usus partiumque studia detorquere. His ut inanem spem praecidamus, omni asseveratione affirmamus nihil velle Nos esse, nihil, opitulante Deo, apud consociationem hominum futuros, nisi Dei, cuius utimur auctoritate, administros. Rationes Dei rationes Nostrae sunt; pro quibus vires omnes vitamque ipsam devovere decretum est. Unde si qui symbolum a Nobis expetant, quod voluntatem animi patefaciat; hoc unum dabimus semper: "Instaurare omnia in Christo!"

Quo quidem in praeclaro opere suscipiendo urgendoque illud Nobis, Venerabiles Fratres, alacritatem affert summam, quod certum habemus fore vos omnes strenuos ad perficiendam rem adiutores. Id enim si dubitemus, ignaros vos, non sane iure, aut negligentes putaverimus nefarii illius belli, quod nunc, ferme ubique, commotum est atque alitur adversus Deum. Vere namque in Auctorem suum "fremuerunt gentes et populi meditati sunt inania" (Ps. ii., 1); ut communis fere ea vox sit adversantium Deo: "Recede a nobis" (Iob xxi., 14). Hinc extincta omnino in plerisque aeterni Dei reverentia, nullaque habita in consuetudine vitae, publice ac privatim, supremi eius numinis ratio; quin totis nervis contenditur omnique artificio, ut vel ipsa recordatio Dei atque notio intereat penitus.

Haec profecto qui reputet, is plane metuat necesse est ne malorum, quae supremo tempore sunt expectanda, sit perversitas haec animorum libamentum quoddam ac veluti exordium; neve filius perditionis, de quo Apostolus loquitur (II. Thess. ii., 3), iam in hisce terris versetur. Tanta scilicet audacia, eo furore religionis pietas ubique impetitur, revelatae fidei documenta oppugnantur, quaeque homini cum Deo officia intercedunt tollere delere prorsus praefracte contenditur! E contra, quae, secundum Apostolum eundem, propria est Antichristi nota, homo ipse, temeritate summa, in Dei locum invasit, extollens se supra omne quod dicitur Deus; usque adeo ut, quamvis Dei notitiam extinguere penitus in se nequeat, Eius tamen maiestate reiecta, aspectabilem hunc mundum sibi ipse veluti templum dedicaverit a ceteris adorandus. "In templo Dei sedeat, ostendens se tamquam sit Deus." (II. Thess. ii., 2.)

Enimvero hoc adversus Deum mortalium certamen qua sorte pugnetur nullus est sanae mentis qui ambigat. Datur quidem homini, libertate sua abutenti, rerum omnium Conditoris ius atque numen violare; verumtamen victoria a Deo semper stat: quin etiam tum propior clades imminet, quum homo, in spe triumphi, insurgit

audentior. Haec ipse Deus nos admonet in Scripturis sanctis. Dissimulat scilicet peccata hominum (Sap. xi., 24), suae veluti potentiae ac maiestatis immemor; mox vero, post adumbratos recessus, "excitatus tamquam potens crapulatus a vino (Ps. lxxvii., 65), confringet capita inimicorum suorum (Ps. lxvii., 22); ut norint omnes "quoniam rex omnis terrae Deus" (Ib. xlvi., 8), "et sciant gentes quoniam homines sunt" (Ib. ix., 20).

Haec quidem, Venerabiles Fratres, fide certa tenemus et expectamus. Attamen non ea impediunt quominus, pro nostra quisque parte, Dei opus maturandum nos etiam curemus: idque, non solum efflagitando assidue: "Exsurge, Domine, non confortetur homo" (Ps. ix., 19); verum, quod plus interest, re et verbo, luce palam, supremum in homines ac naturas ceteras Dei dominatum adserendo vindicandoque, ut Eius imperandi ius ac potestas sancte colatur ab omnibus et observetur.—Quod plane non modo officium postulat a natura profectum, verum etiam communis utilitas nostri generis. Quorumnam etenim, Venerabiles Fratres, animos non conficiat trepidatio ac moeror, quum homines videant, partem maximam, dum quidem humanitatis progressus haud immerito extolluntur, ita digladiari atrociter inter se, ut fere sit omnium in omnes pugna? Cupiditas pacis omnium profecto pectora attingit, eamque nemo est qui non invocet vehementer. Pax tamen, reiecto Numine, absurde quaeritur; unde namque abest Deus, iustitiae exsultat; sublataque iustitia, frustra in spem pacis venitur. "Opus iustitiae pax" (Is. xxxii., 17).—Novimus equidem non paucos esse, qui studio pacis ducti, tranquilitatis nempe ordinis, in coetus factionesque coalescunt, quae ab ordine nominant. Proh tamen spes curasque inanes! Partes ordinis, quae pacem afferre turbatis rebus reapse queant, unae sunt: partes faventium Deo. Has igitur promovere necesse est, ad easque quo licebit plures adducere, si securitatis amore incitamur.

Verum haec ipsa, Venerabiles Fratres, humanarum gentium ad maiestatem Dei imperiumque revocatio, quantumvis licet conemur, numquam nisi per Iesum Christum eveniet. Monet enim Apostolus: "Fundamentum aliud nemo potest ponere praeter id quod positum est, quod est Christus Iesus" (I. Cor. iii., 11). Scilicet unus ipse est, "quem Pater sanctificavit et misit in mundum (Io. x., 36); "splendor Patris et figura substantiae eius" (Hebr. i., 3), Deus verus verusque homo: sine quo, Deum, ut oportet, agnoscere nemo possit; nam "neque Patrem quis novit nisi Filius, et cui voluerit Filius revelare" (Matth. xi., 27).—Ex quo consequitur, ut idem omnino sit "instaurare omnia in Christo" atque homines ad Dei obtemperationem reducere. Huc igitur curas intendamus oportet, ut genus hominum in Christi ditionem redigamus: eo praestito, iam ad ipsum

Deum remigraverit. Ad Deum inquimus, non socordem illum atque humana negligentem, quem materialistarum deliramenta effinxerunt; sed Deum vivum ac verum, unum natura personis trinum, auctorem mundi, omnia sapientissime providentem, iustissimum denique legislatorem, qui sontes plectat, praemia proposita virtutibus habeat.

Porro qua iter nobis ad Christum pateat, ante oculos est: per Ecclesiam videlicet. Quamobrem iure Chrysostomus: "Spes tua Ecclesia, salus tua Ecclesia, refugium tuum Ecclesia" (Hom. de capto Eutropio, n. 6). In id namque illam condidit Christus, quaesitam sui sanguinis pretio; eique doctrinam suam ac suarum praecepta legum commendavit, amplissima simul impertiens divinae gratiae munera ad sanctitatem ac salutem hominum.

Videtis igitur, Venerabiles Fratres, quale demum Nobis vobisque pariter officium sit demandatum: ut consociationem hominum, a Christi sapientia aberrantem, ad Ecclesiae disciplinam revocemus; Ecclesia vero Christo subdet, Christus autem Deo. Quod si, Deo ipso favente, perficiemus, iniquitatem cessisse aequitati gratulabimur, audiemusque feliciter "vocem magnam de coelo dicentem: Nunc facta est salus et virtus et regnum Dei nostri et potestas Christi eius" (Apoc. xii., 10).—Hic tamen ut optatis respondeat exitus, omni ope et opera eniti opus est ut scelus illud immane ac detestabile, aetatis huius proprium, penitus eradamus, quo se nempe homo pro Deo substituit: tum vero leges Evangelii sanctissimae ac consilia in veterem dignitatem vindicanda; adserendae altius veritates ab Ecclesia traditae, quaeque eiusdem sunt documenta de sanctitate coniugii, de educatione doctrinaque puerili, de bonorum possessione atque usu, de officiis in eos qui publicam rem administrant; aequilibritas demum inter varios civitatis ordines christiano instituto ac more restituenda.—Nos profecto haec Nobis, Dei nutui obsequentes, in pontificatu prosequenda proponimus, ac pro virili parte prosequemur. Vestrum autem erit, Venerabiles Fratres, sanctitate, scientia, agendorum usu, studio cum primis divinae gloriae, industriis Nostris obsecundare; nihil aliud spectantes praeterquam ut in omnibus formetur Christus.

Iam quibus ad rem tantam utamur adiumentis, vix dicere oportet; sunt enim de medio sumpta.—Curarum haec prima sunto, ut Christum formemus in iis, qui formando in ceteris Christo officio muneris destinantur. Ad sacerdotes mens spectat, Venerabiles Fratres. Sacris namque quotquot initiati sunt, eam in populis, quibuscum versantur, provinciam sibi datam norint, quam Paulus suscepisse testatus est amantissimis iis verbis: "Filioli mei, quos iterum parturio, donec formetur Christus in vobis" (Gal. iv.). Qui tamen explere munus queant, nisi priores ipsi Christum induerint?

atque ita induerint, ut illud Apostoli eiusdem usurpare possint: "Vivo ego, iam non ego, vivit vero in me Christus" (Gal. ii., 20). "Mihi vivere Christus est" (Philipp. i., 21). Quamobrem, etsi ad fideles omnes pertinet hortatio "ut occurramus in virum perfectum, in mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi" (Ephes. iv., 3); praecipue tamen ad illum spectat qui sacerdotio fungitur; qui idcirco dicitur alter Christus, non una sane potestatis communicatione sed etiam imitatione factorum, qua expressam in se Christi imaginem praeferat.

Quae cum ita sint, quae vobis quantaque, Venerabiles Fratres, ponenda cura est in clero ad sanctitatem omnem formando! huic, quaecumque obveniant, negotia cedere necesse est. Quamobrem pars potior diligentiarum vestrarum sit de seminariis sacris rite ordinandis moderandisque, ut pariter integritate doctrinae et morum sanctitate floreant. Seminarium cordis quisque vestri delicias habetote, nihil plane ad eius utilitatem omittentes, quod est a Tridentina Synodo providentissime constitutum.—Quum vero ad hoc ventum erit ut candidati sacris initiari debeant, ne quaeso excidat animo quod Paulus Timotheo perscripsit: "Nemini cito manus imposueris" (I. Tim. v., 22); illud attentissime reputando, tales plerumque fideles futuros, quales fuerint quos sacerdotio destinabitis. Quare ad privatam quancumque utilitatem respectum ne habetote; sed unice spectetis Deum et Ecclesiam et sempiterna animorum commoda, ne videlicet uti Apostolus praecavet, "communicetis peccatis alienis" (Ibid).—Porro sacerdotes initiati recens atque e seminario digressi industrias vestras ne desiderent. Eos, ex animo hortamur, pectori vestro, quod coelesti igne calere oportet, admovete saepius, incendite, inflammate ut uni Deo et lucris animorum inhiant. Nos equidem, Venerabiles Fratres, diligentissime providebimus ne homines sacri cleri ex insidiis capiantur novae cuiusdam ac fallacis scientiae, quae Christum non redole, quaeque, fucatis astutisque argumentis, rationalismi aut semirationalismi errores invehere nititur; quos ut caveret iam Apostolus Timotheum monebat, scribens: "Depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates et oppositiones falsi nominis scientiae, quam quidam promittentes, circa fidem exciderunt" (I. Tim. vi., 20 s.). Hoc tamen non impedimur quo minus laude dignos existimemus illos e sacerdotibus iunioribus, qui utilium doctrinarum studia, in omni sapientiae genere, persequuntur, ut inde ad veritatem tuendam atque osorum fidei calumnias refellendas instructiores fiant. Verumtamen celare haud possumus, quin etiam apertissime profitemur, primas Nos semper delaturos iis qui, quamvis sacras humanasque disciplinas minime praetereunt, proxime nihilosecius animorum utilitatibus se dedant, eorum procuratione munerum, quae sacerdotem

deceant divinae gloriae studiosum. "Tristitia Nobis magna est et continuus dolor cordi Nostro" (Rom. ix., 2), quum cadere etiam in aetatem nostram conspicimus Ieremiae lamentationem: "Parvuli petierunt panem, et non erat qui frangeret eis" (Thren. iv., 4). Non enim de clero desunt, qui, pro cuiusque ingenio, operam forte navent rebus adumbratae potius quam solidae utilitatis: at verum non adeo multi numerentur qui, ad Christi exemplum, sibi sumant Prophetae dictum: "Spiritus Domini unxit me, evangelizare pauperibus misit me, sanare contritos corde, praedicare captivis remissionem et coecis visum" (Luc. iv., 18-19).—Quem tamen fugiat, Venerabiles Fratres, quum homines ratione maxime ac libertate ducantur, religionis disciplinam potissimam esse viam ad Dei imperium in humanis animis restituendum? Quot plane sunt qui Christum oderunt, qui Ecclesiam, qui Evangelium horrent ignoratione magis quam pravitate animi! de quibus iure dixeris: "quaecumque ignorant blasphemant" (Iud. ii., 10). Idque non in plebe solum reperire est aut in infima multitudine, quae ideo in errorem facile trahitur; sed in excultis etiam ordinibus atque adeo in iis, qui haud mediocri eruditione ceteroqui polleant. Hinc porro in plerisque defectus fidei. Non enim dandum est, scientiae progressibus extingui fidem, sed verius inscitia; ut idcirco ubi maior sit ignorantia, ibi etiam latius pateat fidei defectio. Quapropter Apostolis a Christo mandatum est: "Euntes, docete omnes gentes" (Matth. xxviii., 19).

Nunc autem, ut exdocendi munere ac studio fructus pro spe edantur atque in omnibus formetur Christus, id penitus in memoria insideat, Venerabiles Fratres, nihil omnino esse caritate efficacius. "Non enim in commotione Dominus" (III. Reg. xix., 11). Allici animos ad Deum amariore quodam conatu, speratur perperam: quin etiam errores acerbius increpare, vitia vehementius reprehendere damno magis quam utilitati aliquando est. Timotheum quidem Apostolus hortabatur: "Argue, obsecra, increpa;" attamen addebat: "in omni patientia" (II. Tim. iv., 2). Certe eiusmodi nobis exempla prodidit Christus "Venite," sic ipsum alloquutum legimus, "venite ad me omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego reficiam vos" (Matth. xi., 28). Laborantes autem oneratosque non alios intelligebat, nisi qui peccato vel errore tenerentur. Quanta enimvero in divino illo magistro mansuetudo! quae suavitas, quae in aerumnosos quoslibet miseratio! Cor eius plane pinxit Isaias iis verbis: "Ponam spiritum meum super eum; non contendet neque clamabit; arundinem quessatam non confringet et linum fumigans non extinguet" (Is. xlii., 1 s.). Quae porro caritas, "patiens et benigna" (I. Cor. xiii., 4) ad illos etiam porrigatur necesse est, qui sunt nobis infesti vel nos inimice insectantur. "Maledicimur et benedicimus," ita de se Paulus profitebatur, "persecutionem patimur et sustinemus,

blasphemamur et obsecramus" (Ibid. iv., 12 s.). Peiores forte quam sunt videntur. Consuetudine enim aliorum, praeiudicatis opinionibus, alienis consiliis et exemplis malesuada demum verecundia in impiorum partem translati sunt: attamen eorum voluntas non adeoest depravata, sicut et ipsi putari gestiunt. Quidni speremus christianae caritatis flammam ab animis caliginem dispulsuram atque allaturam simul Dei lumen et pacem? Tardabitur quandoque forsitan laboris nostri fructus; sed caritas sustentatione nunquam defatigatur, memor non esse praemia a Deo proposita laborum fructibus sed voluntati.

Attamen, Venerabiles Fratres, non ea Nobis mens est ut, in toto hoc opere tam arduo restitutionis humanarum gentium in Christo, nullos vos clerusque vester adiutores habeatis. Scimus mandasse Deum unicuique de proximo suo (Eccli. xvii., 12). Non igitur eos tantum, qui sacris se addixerunt, sed universos prorsus fideles rationibus Dei et animorum adlaborare oportet: non marte utique quemque suo atque ingenio, verum semper Episcoporum ductu atque nutu; praeesse namque, docere, moderari nemini in Ecclesia datur praeter quam vobis, "quos Spiritus Sanctus posuit regere Ecclesiam Dei" (Act. xx., 28). Catholicos homines, vario quidem consilio at semper religionis bono, coire inter se societatem, Decessores Nostri probavere iamdiu bonaque precatione sanxerunt. Institutum porro egregium Nos etiam laudatione Nostra ornare non dubitamus, optamusque vehementer ut urbibus agrisque late inferatur ac floreat. Verumenimvero consociationes eiusmodi eo primo ac potissimum spectare volumus, ut quotquot in illas cooptantur christiano more constanter vivant. Parum profecto interest quaestiones multas subtiliter agitari, deque iuribus et officiis eloquenter disseri, ubi haec ab actione fuerint seiugata. Postulant enim actionem tempora; sed eam quae tota sit in divinis legibus atque Ecclesiae praescriptis sancte integreque servandis, in religione libere aperteque profitenda, in omnigenae demum caritatis operibus exercendis, nullo sui aut terrenarum utilitatum respectu. Illustria eiusmodi tot Christi militum exempla longe magis valitura sunt ad commovendos animos rapiendosque quam verba exquisitaeque disceptationes; fietque facile ut, abiecto metu, depulsis praeiudiciis ac dubitationibus, quamplurimi ad Christum traducantur provehantque ubique notitiam eius et amorem; quae ad germanam solidamque beatitatem sunt via. Profecto si in urbibus, si in pagis quibusvis praecepta Dei tenebuntur fideliter, si sacris erit honos, si frequens sacramentorum usus, si cetera custodientur quae ad christianae vitae rationem pertinent; nihil admodum, Venerabiles Fratres, elaborandum erit ulterius ut omnia in Christo instaurentur. Neque haec solum coelestium bonorum prosequutionem spectare existimentur:

iuvabunt etiam, quam quae maxime, ad huius aevi publicasque civitatum utilitates. His namque obtentis, optimates ac locupletes aequitate simul et caritate tenuioribus aderunt, hi vero afflictioris fortunae angustias sedate ac patienter ferent; cives non cupiditati sed legibus parebunt; principes et quotquot rempublicam gerunt, quorum "non est potestas nisi a Deo" (Rom. xiii., 1), vereri ac diligere sanctum erit. Quid plura? Tunc demum omnibus persuasum fuerit debere Ecclesiam, prouti ab auctore Christo est condita, plena integraque libertate frui nec alienae dominationi subiici; Nosque, in hac ipsa libertate vindicanda, non religionis modo sanctissima tueri iura, verum etiam communi populorum bono ac securitati prospicere. Scilicet "pietas ad omnia utilis est" (I. Tim. iv., 8): eaque incolumi ac vigente, "sedebit reapse populus in plenitudine pacis" (Is. xxxii., 18).

Deus, "qui dives est in misericordia" (Ephes. ii., 4), hanc humanarum gentium in Christo Iesu instaurationem benignus, festinet; "non enim volentis opus neque currentis sed miserentis est Dei" (Rom. ix., 16). Nos vero, Venerabiles Fratres, "in spiritu humilitatis" (Dan. iii., 39), quotidiana et instanti prece id ab Eo contendamus ob Iesu Christi merita. Utamur praeterea praesentissima Deiparae impetratione: cui conciliandae Nobis, quoniam has litteras die ipsa damus, quae recolendo Mariali Rosario est instituta; quidquid Decessor Noster de Octobri mense Virgini augustae dicando edixit, publica per templa omnia eiusdem Rosarii recitatione, Nos pariter edicimus et confirmamus; monentes insuper ut deprecatores etiam adhibeantur castissimus Dei Matris Sponsus catholicae Ecclesiae patronus sanctique Petrus et Paulus apostolorum principes.

Quae omnia ut rite eveniant et cuncta vobis pro desiderio fortunentur, divinarum gratiarum subsidia uberrime exoramus. Testem vero suavissimae caritatis, qua vos et universos fideles, quos Dei providentia Nobis commendatos voluit, complectimur, vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, clero populoque vestro apostolicam benedictionem amantissime in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die iv Octobris MCMIII., Pontificatus Nostri anno primo.

PIUS PP. X.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER PIUS X.

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE.

To the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops and Other Ordinaries in Peace and Communion with the Apostolic See.

PIUS X., POPE.

Venerable Brethren, Health and the Apostolic Benediction:

IN addressing you for the first time from the chair of the supreme apostolate to which we have, by the inscrutable disposition of God, been elevated, it is not necessary to remind you with what tears and earnest prayers we exerted ourselves to evade this formidable burden of the Pontificate. Unequal in merit though we be, with St. Anselm, it seems to us that we may with truth make our own the words in which he lamented when he was constrained against his will and in spite of his struggles to receive the honor of the episcopate. For to show with what dispositions of mind and will we subjected ourselves to the most serious charge of feeding the flock of Christ, we can well adduce those same proofs of grief which he invokes in his own behalf. "My tears are witnesses," he wrote, "and the sounds and moanings issuing from the anguish of my heart, such as I never remember before to have come from me for any sorrow, before that day on which there seemed to fall upon me that great misfortune of the archbishopric of Canterbury. And those who fixed their gaze on my face that day could not fail to see it. . . . . I, in color more like a dead than a living man, was pale for amazement and alarm. Hitherto I have resisted as far as I could, speaking the truth, my election or rather the violence done me. But now I am constrained to confess, whether I will or no, that the judgments of God oppose greater and greater resistance to my efforts, so that I see no way of escaping them. Wherefore vanquished as I am by the violence not so much of men as of God, against which there is no providing, I realize that nothing is left for me, after having prayed as much as I could and striven that this chalice should if possible pass from me without my drinking it, but to set aside my feeling and my will and resign myself entirely to the design and the will of God."

In truth, reasons both numerous and most weighty were not lacking to justify this resistance of ours. For beside the fact that we deemed ourselves altogether unworthy through our insignificance of seeing himself designated to succeed him who, ruling the Church

the honor of the Pontificate, who would not have been disturbed at with supreme wisdom for nearly twenty-six years, showed himself adorned with such sublimity of mind, such lustre of every virtue, as to attract to himself the admiration even of adversaries and to leave his memory consecrated by glorious achievements?

Then, again, to omit other motives, we were terrified beyond all else by the disastrous state of human society to-day. For who can fail to see that society is at the present time, more than in any past age, suffering from a terrible and deep-rooted malady which, developing every day and eating into its inmost being, is dragging it to destruction? You understand, Venerable Brethren, what this disease is—apostasy from God than which in truth nothing is more allied with ruin, according to the word of the prophet: "For behold they that go far from Thee shall perish" (Ps. lxxii., 17). We saw, therefore, that in virtue of the ministry of the Pontificate which was to be entrusted to us, we must hasten to find a remedy for this great evil, considering as addressed to us that Divine command: "Lo, I have set thee this day over the nations and over kingdoms, to root up, and to pull down, and to waste, and to destroy, and to build and to plant" (Jerem. i., 10). But, cognizant of our weakness, we recoiled in terror from a task as urgent as it is arduous.

THE POPE'S PROGRAMME.

Since, however, it has been pleasing to the Divine Will to raise our lowliness to such sublimity of power, we take courage in Him who strengthens us, and setting ourselves to work, relying on the power of God, we proclaim that we have no other programme in the Supreme Pontificate but that "of restoring all things in Christ" (Ephes. i., 10), so that "Christ may be all and in all" (Coloss. iii., 2). Some will certainly be found who, measuring Divine things by human standards, will seek to discover secret aims of ours, distorting them to an earthly purpose and to political designs. To eliminate all vain delusions for such, we say to them with emphasis that we do not wish to be and with the Divine assistance never shall be aught before human society but the minister of God, of whose authority we are the depository. The interests of God shall be our interests, and for these we are resolved to spend all our strength and our very life. Hence, should any one ask us for a symbol as the expression of our will, we will give this and no other: "To renew all things in Christ."

In undertaking this glorious task we are greatly quickened by the certainty that we shall have all of you, Venerable Brethren, as generous coöperators. Did we doubt it, we should have to regard you, unjustly, as either unconscious or heedless of that sacrilegious

war which is now almost everywhere stirred up and fomented against God. For in truth "the nations have raged and the peoples imagined vain things" (Ps. ii., 1) against their Creator; so frequent is the cry of the enemies of God: "Depart from us" (Job xxi., 14). And as might be expected, we find extinguished among the majority of men all respect for the Eternal God and no regard paid in the manifestations of public and private life to the Supreme Will—nay, every effort and every artifice is used to destroy utterly the memory and the knowledge of God.

When all this is considered, there is good reason to fear lest this great perversity may be, as it were, a foretaste and perhaps the beginning of those evils which are reserved for the last days, and that there may be already in the world the "Son of Perdition" of whom the Apostle speaks (II. Thess. ii., 4). Such, in truth, is the audacity and the wrath employed everywhere in persecuting religion, in combating the dogmas of the faith, in resolute effort to uproot and destroy all relations between man and the Divinity. While, on the other hand, and this according to the same apostle is the distinguishing mark of Antichrist, man has with infinite temerity put himself in the place of God, raising himself above all that is called God; in such wise that although he cannot utterly extinguish in himself all knowledge of God, he has contemned God's majesty and, as it were, made of the universe a temple wherein he himself is to be adored. "He sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God" (II. Thess. ii., 2).

Verily, no one of sound mind can doubt the issue of this contest between man and the Most High. Man, abusing his liberty, can violate the right and the majesty of the Creator of the Universe; but the victory will ever be with God—nay, defeat is at hand at the moment when man, under the delusion of his triumph, rises up with most audacity. Of this we are assured in the holy books by God Himself. Unmindful, as it were, of His strength and greatness, He "overlooks the sins of men" (Wisd. xi., 24), but swiftly, after these apparent retreats, "awaked like a mighty man that hath been surfeited with wine" (Ps. lxxvii., 65), "He shall break the heads of his enemies" (Ps. lxvii., 22), that all may know "that God is the king of all the earth" (Ib. lxvi., 8), "that the Gentiles may know themselves to be men" (Ib. ix., 20).

PEACE TO THE NATIONS.

All this, Venerable Brethren, we believe and expect with unshakable faith. But this does not prevent us also, according to the measure given to each, from exerting ourselves to hasten the work of God—and not merely by praying assiduously: "Arise, O Lord,

let not man be strengthened" (Ib. ix., 19), but, more important still, by affirming both by word and deed and in the light of day, God's supreme dominion over man and all things, so that His right to command and His authority may be fully realized and respected.

This is imposed upon us not only as a natural duty, but by our common interest. For, Venerable Brethren, who can avoid being appalled and afflicted when he beholds, in the midst of a progress in civilization which is justly extolled, the greater part of mankind fighting among themselves so savagely as to make it seem as though strife were universal? The desire for peace is certainly harbored in every breast, and there is no one who does not ardently invoke it. But to want peace without God is an absurdity, seeing that where God is absent thence, too, justice flies, and when justice is taken away it is vain to cherish the hope of peace. "And the work of justice shall be peace." (Is. xxxii., 17). There are many, we are well aware, who, in yearning for peace, that is to say, the tranquillity of order, band themselves into societies and parties which they style parties of order. Hope and labor lost! For there is but one party of order capable of restoring peace in the midst of all this turmoil, and that is the party of God. It is this party, therefore, that we must advance, and to it attract as many as possible, if we are really urged by the love of peace.

THROUGH CHRIST ALONE.

But, Venerable Brethren, we shall never, however much we exert ourselves, succeed in calling men back to the majesty and empire of God except by means of Jesus Christ. "No one," the Apostle admonishes us, "can lay other foundation than that which has been laid, which is Jesus Christ" (I. Cor. iii., 11). It is Christ alone "whom the Father sanctified and sent into this world" (Is. x., 36), "the splendor of the Father and the image of His substance" (Hebr. i., 3), true God and true man; without whom nobody can know God with the knowledge for salvation, "neither doth any one know the Father but the Son, and he to whom it shall please the Son to reveal him" (Matt. xi., 27). Hence it follows that to restore all things in Christ and to lead men back to submission to God is one and the same aim. To this, then, it behooves us to devote our care—to lead back mankind under the dominion of Christ; this done, we shall have brought it back to God. When we say to God, we do not mean to that inert being heedless of all things human which the dream of materialists has imagined, but to the true and living God, one in nature, triple in person, Creator of the world, most wise ordainer of all things, Lawgiver most just, who punishes the wicked and has reward in store for the virtuous.

BY THE CHURCH.

Now, the way to reach Christ is not hard to find: it is the Church. Rightly does Chrysostom inculcate: "The Church is thy hope, the Church is thy salvation, the Church is thy refuge" (Hom. de capto Eutropio," n. 6). It was for this that Christ founded it, gaining it at the price of His blood, and made it the depository of His doctrine and His laws, bestowing upon it at the same time an inexhaustible treasury of graces for the sanctification and salvation of men.

You see, then, Venerable Brethren, the duty that has been imposed alike upon us and upon you of bringing back to the discipline of the Church human society now estranged from the wisdom of Christ; the Church will then subject it to Christ, and Christ to God. If we, through the goodness of God Himself, bring this task to a happy issue, we shall be rejoiced to see evil giving place to good and hear for our gladness "a loud voice from heaven saying: Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God and the power of His Christ" (Apoc. xii., 10). But if our desire to obtain this is to be fulfilled, we must use every means and exert all our energy to bring about the utter disappearance of that enormous and detestable wickedness so characteristic of our time—the substitution of man for God; this done, it remains to restore to their ancient place of honor the most holy laws and counsels of the Gospel; to proclaim aloud the truths taught by the Church, as her teachings on the sanctity of marriage, on the education and discipline of youth, on the possession and use of property and the duties that men owe to those who rule the State, and, lastly, to restore equilibrium between the different classes of society according to Christian precept and custom. This is what we, in submitting ourselves to the manifestations of the Divine will, purpose to aim at during our Pontificate, and we will use all our industry to attain it. It is for you, Venerable Brethren, to second our efforts by your holiness, knowledge and experience, and above all by your zeal for the glory of God, with no other aim than that Christ may be formed in all.

FORMATION OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

As to the means to be employed in attaining this great end, it seems superfluous to name them, for they are obvious of themselves. Let your first care be to form Christ in those who are destined from the duty of their vocation to form Him in others. We speak of the priests, Venerable Brethren. For all who bear the seal of the priesthood must know that they have the same mission to the people in the midst of whom they live as that which Paul in these tender words proclaimed that he received: "My little children, of whom I

am in labor again until Christ be formed in you" (Gal. iv., 19). But how will they be able to perform this duty if they be not first clothed with Christ themselves? and so clothed with Christ as to be able to say with the Apostle: "I live, yet not I, but Christ lives in me" (Ibid, ii., 20). "For me to live is Christ" (Philip. i., 21). Hence although all are included in the exhortation "to advance towards the perfect man, in the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ" (Ephes. iv., 3), it is addressed before all others to him who exercises the sacerdotal ministry; who is therefore called another Christ not merely by the communication of power, but by reason of the imitation of His works; and he should therefore bear stamped upon himself the image of Christ.

This being so, Venerable Brethren, of what nature and magnitude is the care that must be taken by you in forming the clergy to holiness! All other tasks must yield to this one. Wherefore the chief part of your diligence will be directed to governing and ordering your seminaries aright so that they may flourish equally in the soundness of their teaching and in the spotlessness of their morals. Regard your seminary as the delight of your hearts, and neglect on its behalf none of those provisions which the Council of Trent has with admirable forethought prescribed. And when the time comes for promoting the youthful candidates to holy orders, ah! do not forget what Paul wrote to Timothy: "Impose not hands lightly upon any man" (I. Tim. v., 22), bearing carefully in mind that as a general rule the faithful will be such as are those whom you call to the priesthood. Do not, then, pay heed to private interests of any kind, but have at heart only God and the Church and the eternal welfare of souls, so that, as the Apostle admonishes, "you may not be partakers of the sins of others" (Ibid). Then, again, be not lacking in solicitude for young priests who have just left the seminary. From the bottom of our heart we urge you to bring them often close to your breast, which should burn with celestial fire—kindle them, inflame them, so that they may aspire solely after God and the salvation of souls. Rest assured, Venerable Brethren, that we on our side will use the greatest diligence to prevent the members of the clergy from being drawn to the snares of a certain new and fallacious science, which savoreth not of Christ, but with masked and cunning arguments strives to open the door to the errors of rationalism and semi-rationalism, against which the Apostle warned Timothy to be on his guard when he wrote: "Keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding the profane novelties of words and oppositions of knowledge falsely so called which some promising have erred concerning the faith" (I. Tim. vi., 20 s.). This does not prevent us from esteeming worthy of praise those young

priests who dedicate themselves to useful studies in every branch of learning the better to prepare themselves to defend the truth and to refute the calumnies of the enemies of the faith. Yet we cannot conceal, nay, we proclaim in the most open manner possible that our preference is, and ever will be, for those who, while cultivating ecclesiastical and literary erudition, dedicate themselves more closely to the welfare of souls through the exercise of those ministries proper to a priest zealous of the Divine glory. "It is a great grief and a continual sorrow to our heart" (Rom. ix., 2) to find Jeremiah's lamentation applicable to our times: "The little ones asked for bread, and there was none to break it to them" (Lam. iv., 4). For there are not lacking among the clergy those who adapt themselves according to their bent to works of more apparent than real solidity—but not so numerous, perhaps, are those who, after the example of Christ, take to themselves the words of the prophet: "The Spirit of the Lord hath anointed me, hath sent me to evangelize the poor, to heal the contrite of heart, to announce freedom to the captive and sight to the blind" (Luke iv., 18, 19).

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

Yet who can fail to see, Venerable Brethren, that while men are led by reason and liberty, the principal way to restore the empire of God in their souls is religious instruction? How many there are who hate Christ and abhor the Church and the Gospel more through ignorance than through badness of mind, of whom it may well be said: "They blaspheme whatever things they know not" (Jude ii., 10). This is found to be the case not only among the people at large and among the lowest classes, who are thus easily led astray, but even among the more cultivated and those enriched in other respects with great erudition. The result is for a great many the loss of the faith. For it is not true that the progress of knowledge extinguishes the faith; rather is it ignorance; and the more ignorance prevails the greater is the havoc wrought by incredulity. And this is why Christ commanded the Apostles: "Going forth teach all nations" (Matt. xxviii., 19).

But in order that the desired fruit may be derived from this apostolate and this zeal for teaching, and that Christ may be formed in all be it remembered, Venerable Brethren, that no means is more efficacious than charity, "For the Lord is not in the earthquake" (III. Kings xix., 11)—it is vain to hope to attract souls to God by a bitter zeal. On the contrary, harm is done more often than good by taunting men harshly with their faults and reproving their vices with asperity. True, the Apostle exhorted Timothy: "Accuse, beseech, rebuke," but he took care to add: "With all patience"

(II. Tim. iv., 2). Jesus has certainly left us examples of this. "Come to me," we will find Him saying, "come to me all ye that labor and are burthened and I will refresh you" (Matt. xi., 28). And by those that labor and are burthened He meant only those who are slaves of sin and error. What gentleness was that shown by the Divine Master! What tenderness, what compassion towards all kinds of misery! Isaias has marvelously described His heart in the words: "I will set my spirit upon him; he shall not contend, nor cry out; the bruised reed he will not break, he will not extinguish the smoking flax" (Is. xlii., 1 s.). This charity, "patient and kind" (I. Cor. xiii., 4), will extend itself also to those who are hostile to us and persecute us. "We are reviled," thus did St. Paul protest, "and we bless; we are persecuted, and we suffer it; we are blasphemed, and we entreat" (I. Cor. iv., 12 s.). They perhaps seem to be worse than they really are. Their associations with others, prejudice, the counsel, advice and example of others, and finally an ill-advised shame have dragged them to the side of the impious; but their wills are not so depraved as they themselves would seek to make people believe. Who will prevent us from hoping that the flame of Christian charity may dispel the darkness from their minds and bring to them light and the peace of God? It may be that the fruits of our labors may be slow in coming, but charity wearies not with waiting, knowing that God prepares His rewards not for the results of toil, but for the good will shown in it.

WORK FOR THE LAITY.

It is true, venerable brethren, that in this arduous task of the restoration of the human race in Christ neither you nor your clergy should exclude all assistance. We know that God recommended every one to have a care for his neighbor (Eccli. xvii., 12). For it is not priests alone, but all the faithful without exception who must concern themselves with the interests of God and souls—not, of course, according to their own views, but always under the direction and orders of the bishops; for to no one in the Church except you is it given to preside over, to teach, to "rule the Church of God wherein the Holy Ghost has placed you bishops" (Acts xx., 28). Our predecessors have long since approved and blessed those Catholics who have banded together in societies of various kinds, but always religious in their aim. We, too, have no hesitation in awarding our praise to this great idea, and we earnestly desire to see it propagated and flourish in town and country. But we wish that all such associations aim first and chiefly at the constant maintenance of Christian life among those who belong to them. For truly it is of little avail to discuss questions with nice subtlety, or

to discourse eloquently of rights and duties, when all this is unconnected with practice. The times we live in demand action—but action which consists entirely in observing with fidelity and zeal the divine laws and the precepts of the Church, in the frank and open profession of religion, in the exercise of every kind of charitable works, without regard to self-interest or worldly advantage. Such luminous examples given by the great army of soldiers of Christ will be of much greater avail in moving and drawing men than words and sublime dissertations; and it will easily come about that when human respect has been driven out, and prejudices and doubting laid aside, large numbers will be won to Christ, becoming in their turn promoters of His knowledge and love which are the road to true and solid happiness. Oh! when in every city and village the law of the Lord is faithfully observed, when respect is shown for sacred things, when the sacraments are frequented and the ordinances of Christian life fulfilled, there certainly will be no more need for us to labor further to see all things restored in Christ. Nor is it for the attainment of eternal welfare alone that this will be of service—it will also contribute largely to temporal welfare and the advantage of human society. For when these conditions have been secured, the upper and wealthy classes will learn to be just and charitable to the lowly, and these will be able to bear with tranquillity and patience the trials of a very hard lot; the citizens will obey not lust, but law; reverence and love will be deemed a duty towards those that govern, "whose power comes only from God" (Rom. xiii., 1). And then? Then at last it will be clear to all that the Church, such as it was instituted by Christ, must enjoy full and entire liberty and independence from all external dominion; and we, in demanding that same liberty, are defending not only the sacred rights of religion, but are also consulting the common weal and the safety of nations. For it continues to be true that "piety is useful for all things" (I. Tim. iv., 8)—when this is strong and flourishing "the people will" truly "sit in the fullness of peace" (Is. xxxii., 18).

May God, "who is rich in mercy" (Ephes. ii., 4), benignly speed this restoration of the human race in Jesus Christ, for "it is not of him that willeth, or of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy" (Rom. ix., 16). And let us, Venerable Brethren, "in the spirit of humility" (Dan. iii., 39), with continuous and urgent prayer ask this of Him through the merits of Jesus Christ. Let us turn, too, to the most powerful intercession of the Divine Mother—to obtain which we, addressing to you this letter of ours on the day appointed especially for commemorating the Holy Rosary, ordain and confirm all our predecessor's prescriptions with regard to the

dedication of the present month to the august Virgin by the public recitation of the Rosary in all churches; with the further exhortation that as intercessors with God, appeal be also made to the most pure Spouse of Mary, the Patron of the Catholic Church, and the holy Princes of the Apostles, Peter and Paul.

And that all this may be realized in fulfillment of our ardent desire, and that everything may be prosperous with you, we invoke upon you the most bountiful gifts of divine grace. And now in testimony of that most tender charity wherewith we embrace you and all the faithful whom Divine Providence has entrusted us, we impart with all affection in the Lord the Apostolic blessings to you, Venerable Brethren, to the clergy and to your people.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's, on the fourth day of October, 1903, in the first year of our Pontificate.

PIUS X.

A CRUSADE OF WEALTH: A NEED OF THE TIMES.

IT WILL be an evil day for the world if ever that noble spirit of enterprise and self-denying energy which distinguishes the Anglo-Saxon race becomes wholly and definitely sacrificed on the altar of Mammon. If so, those qualities which are a precious part of God's endowment of our race will be turned into instruments of decay, swift and putrescent. Yet the danger is a real one and the remedy is hard to find. The desire of private gain without regard for the common good, the spread of luxury on the one hand and of pauperism on the other, are evils which sorely exercise the minds of statesmen, for no state can last long where selfishness abounds. Greater still is the dismay in the hearts of the pastors of the Church as they view the decay of faith and that falling away from the practice of religion which is consequent upon the growth of worldliness and the progress of ideals contrary to those of Christianity.

A new gospel is being preached, the gospel of wealth. This gospel is in its essence material, but, as any teaching professedly and openly material cannot attract mankind as a whole, the underlying essence is partly concealed under a halo of grand moral ideas and high-sounding shibboleths. If, therefore, wealth is to be sought, it must be sought in the name of philanthropy and public spirit, and if commerce, the great highway of wealth, is to be fol-

lowed, it must be followed in the interests of civilization and world-wide beneficence. Empire, too, must never be sought for from the mere love of domineering, nor to enrich oneself at other people's expense, but for the common advantage of ruler and ruled; while no ruler must be considered fit for his post unless he feels himself under heavy responsibilities to the world at large.

Such is the aim of the new gospel and such are its motives. The motives, it is true, would go far to sanctify the aim if this latter were, in reality and as it professes to be, the means and not the end of action, or, in other words, if we sought for wealth with all its personal advantages, not for its own sake, not for our private gain, but from a sheer sense of duty and of love for our country. Now, a very slight knowledge of the facts of human nature is enough to show us that this unselfish subordination of means to ends does not widely exist. We may salve our conscience a little with the thought that our greed is patriotic, but too often our patriotism is a mere adjunct to our selfishness, a sort of ornamental buttress to a building which could stand just as well alone, but would be too obviously ugly by its bare self.

Moreover, we must never forget that philanthropy and beneficence as motives of action cannot be final. They, in their turn, must be subordinated to the love of God. Without this relation to the absolute good they are words with little meaning and, as effective principles of action, they can stand neither steady nor long. It is perfectly true, indeed, that altruism is inherent in our nature. No man can be purely and entirely selfish. Even those whose leading principles are selfish will often find much room in their hearts for the higher sentiments of patriotism and benevolence. But just as physical forces, to be effective, must be organized, so too our moral forces, our sentiments and nobler passions cannot, with safety, be left to themselves. They stand in need of careful organization, and must be directed by a power higher than themselves. The sinews and the courage of a private soldier are forces in reserve and are useless without direction. Before he can strike an effective blow at a distance, deep-laid plans have to be thought out and very complicated machinery to be set in motion. Still more complex is the forethought and higher still is the power which must direct the moral forces of a man or of a nation. Sentiment is, in reality, for many purposes, a stronger force than self-interest, and that is the reason why the apostles of the gospel of wealth engage it in their service. Men will fight more readily and more bravely for ideas than they will for gold and commercial interests. Though these latter may be foremost in the minds of statesmen, they are not so in the minds of the people. In the war of North and South,

the Spanish-American war and the Transvaal war it was ideas that were principally at stake—ideas of humanity, race predominance or the civil equality of black and white. It was diversity of sentiment which put off for so long the union of Scotland with England in spite of the temptation of commercial advantage, while it is the same cause which still prevents the true and hearty union of England and Ireland. Community of sentiment, moreover, is the cement of empires and the only firm bond of alliance. Such union may begin with identity of trade interests and common advantage, but unless these selfish motives yield the first place to something better than themselves they will cease to operate with mankind for any high purpose.

The strong moral forces of altruism, patriotism and philanthropy, however, may very easily be turned into wrong directions. We may love our fellow-men, but benefits we wish to confer upon them may be evils in disguise. Our patriotism, like that of the ancient Romans, may lead us to set up our country as a god. We may spend our national wealth in trying to civilize the African savage, and succeed in making him worse than he was before—a spoilt child, with no knowledge of the world to come and a brutal incapacity to enjoy what is best in the present. We may educate the Japanese in our science and our philosophy, teach them to develop the resources of their country, and end by converting them into a nation of upstarts with their heads full of Western ideas, but without that basis of Christianity on which Western civilization was built and on which alone it can firmly stand. We may, in short, do more harm to the world by our supposed virtues than we do by our acknowledged vices, our greed and our worship of Mammon. Our so-called virtues can never wholly deserve the name of virtue until they are made the servants of our religion, until they are disciplined by an authority which is ultimately divine. Without that subordination and direction they are but indifferent qualities equally at the service of good or evil. Unless a man's life is ruled by principles based on faith his moral development will be largely swayed by the coercion of circumstances, a tyranny which natural goodness is unable to withstand. *"Vis consilî expers mole ruit sua,"*[1] says Horace, and if profound scientific knowledge is necessary in order to direct the physical forces of nature, how much more is it needed to direct the more potent and complex energies of our moral being? It is the forgetfulness of this truth and the belief that man's natural goodness will assert itself without the help of religion that is daily weakening the foundations of our present civilization.

The dependence of the natural on the supernatural and the sub-

[1] Strength without judgment falls by its own weight.

ordination of human action to a divinely constituted guidance was a fundamental idea in the theory of the mediæval empire. According to that theory all Christian states formed a great political unity under the sway of the Pope. He was their supreme visible ruler in spiritual matters and their final arbitrator in temporal concerns. It was for him, too, to interfere when the actions of princes went against the eternal principles of right and wrong. The theory, at the best of times, was never fully carried out in practice, but, none the less, it had an important influence on the politics of the time. To it was due, in large measure, the growth of civic freedom in Europe and the emancipation of citizens from the tyranny of feudalism. It did much to secure the proper distribution of wealth by means of laws against usury, by the protection of church property and by the prohibition of unjust taxation. But perhaps the most striking instance of the political influence exercised by the Church is furnished us by the Crusades.

When the barbarous tribes which overthrew the Roman Empire were, in their turn, conquered by the gentle influence of the Gospel, they were far from suddenly changing their natural character. Though they produced a goodly array of saints and of men who retired from the world to seek after perfection, the great body of those who remained in the world were still subject to many of the vices of their forefathers. They were still fierce and turbulent and looked upon war as their noblest occupation. The feudal system under which they lived was framed upon the idea that the whole nation was an armed camp, and military service was the ordinary rent paid for the tenure of land. The great lords and barons, who, often enough, paid but a doubtful allegiance to their overlords, loved fighting for its own sake and, as they had little to do in time of peace, they were ever ready to settle their quarrels by the sword. Nor did they always consider it beneath their dignity to engage in open robbery. The prosperous merchants of the city whom they despised and whose growing power they feared were looked upon by them as a fair prey, and they considered that the most honorable way to provide the means of luxury was to take it by force. It is clear that, in such a state of things, neither national prosperity nor religion were likely to advance very quickly, and strong efforts were made by the peace-loving members of the community, backed by the powerful support of the Church, to remedy the evils of the time. It was not so much the worship of Mammon as the worship of Mars which was fretting away the sinews of the Christian world. We are told, in the Iliad, how the ruthless, swaggering war-god was wounded and driven from the field by Diomede, helped by Athene, the goddess of wisdom. His career was stopped, indeed, for a time,

but the god of war was immortal, and it was not long before he returned to the fray, pitiless and violent as before. The much vexed pioneers of commerce found in their well-trained citizen armies a Diomede who could check the course of the Mars that harried them. In this case, too, he again returned to the fray, still immortal, still untamed, but taught to fight under new conditions and in behalf of new allies.

In the year 1096 all Europe was stirred by the preparations for the great crusade. Twenty years before, Jerusalem, which had long been a flourishing mart under the peaceful rule of the Saracens, had fallen into the hands of the Seljakian Turks, who despised commerce and oppressed pilgrims and merchants alike. So powerful were these fierce Mohammedan warriors that they became a serious menace not only to the trade of Europe, but to Christianity itself. The Byzantine Empire was threatened and the Eastern commerce of Italy was already ruined. It was time for all those whose interests or religious feelings had suffered from the calamity to unite and strike a blow for the recovery of the holy places. A holy war was preached by Peter the Hermit and proclaimed by Pope Urban II. The monarchs of Europe, who were engaged in consolidating their dominions, were not sorry to part with their warlike and often turbulent vassals, while these latter were eased in conscience at the prospect of an adventure which had in it so much relish of salvation. Indeed the Crusade afforded a glorious opportunity for usefully employing all the restless spirits and directing in a worthy channel all the disturbing forces of Europe. The principle of making friends of the Mammon of iniquity was extended to his brother Mars. The war-god was being made to fight in a Christian harness, while his devotees exchanged their unhallowed worship of him for a relative if not inferior honor directed ultimately to the true god of battles.

It cannot be denied, of course, that motives of self-interest had a good deal to do with the promotion of the Crusades. But we must, in the first place, draw a distinction between well-ordered self-interest on the one hand and selfishness on the other. Now, no serious person would wish to banish the former from the list of worthy motives of human action. The most unselfish of men has his own true interests at heart, and the more devotedly he loves God the more wisely and securely is he providing for his own interests. In the purest act of divine love, of course, self is not considered, but then that act, of its own nature, necessarily tends to the creature's advantage, so that in seeking God he cannot, as far as his action goes, help seeking himself. Moreover, we must remember that between absolute selfishness, which consists in pure

self-seeking without any higher motive, and the highest purity of intention, there are various degrees of ordination in our aims. If they are directed by some sentiment or principle referable to God they are, so far forth, well-ordered, otherwise they are inordinate if not actually sinful. To refine and purify our motives with scientific precision is the work of asceticism or the science of the spiritual life, an advanced course of which must necessarily be reserved for the chosen few who are, par excellence, the salt of the earth. The mass of mankind have to be taken as they are and gradually elevated by rougher methods in which absolute precision is out of place. All men are naturally selfish. Their selfishness must therefore be changed by the best available means into some form of well-ordered self-seeking. This is precisely what was done in the Crusades, so that in that manifold host which reconquered Jerusalem from the Turks, while there were many who acted from the highest motives, the effective majority was composed of men whose grounds of action were more or less imperfectly regulated. The leaders of the enterprise, men like Peter the Hermit and St. Bernard, were members of God's aristocracy, men of peace, raised far above all mundane hopes and born to be the soul of a great movement, but thews and sinews for the work were furnished by the rank and file of ordinary Christians.

One of the great needs of our time is a Peter the Hermit or a St. Bernard to preach and organize a crusade of wealth. We can no more persuade mankind to give up money-getting than the mediæval saints could persuade their fellow-men to give up fighting, nor is it desirable that we should. Money rightly gotten and rightly spent is as powerful an instrument for good as was the sword of Godfrey de Bouillon, but for our crusade we must find our Bernard as well as our Godfrey. The one must be eminent for actual poverty, the other for poverty of spirit. The one must direct the golden current from the dry bank, the other must stand in the stream, washed but unsullied by its waves. We have such possible Godfreys among our millionaires, but they are knight-errants in wealth's chivalry, few in number, and no universal movement has ever yet clamored for them as leaders.

That the time is growing ripe for such a movement there are indications not a few. The very need of it, more or less clearly recognized, is a strong argument that it will be attempted under wise or unwise auspices. The writings of Mr. Andrew Carnegie are a proof that there are not wanting some at least among our plutocrats who are alive to the dangers and the responsibilities of wealth. His theory is that money gained from the labor of thousands must be spent for the benefit of thousands, and that no man

should be entrusted with a penny unless he feels himself accountable to some one for the spending of it. Nor have Mr. Carnegie's ideas remained in the region of theory. He has himself set the example of colossal beneficence on both sides of the Atlantic, the chief objects of his donations being education, scientific research and general enlightenment. Others have followed in his wake, nor have they always thought it enough to reserve themselves for the great final act of renunciation in their wills. They have given personal support as well as money to their good works, and taken a living interest in their progress. Such large handed munificence springs, no doubt, from natural generosity, but there is besides another motive underlying it, the motive of self-defense. The uneven distribution of wealth which results from the conditions of modern industry is held by many to constitute a grave injustice to those by whose labor that wealth is produced, and so strong is this feeling that we are threatened with a violent upheaval of the present state of things. The danger may be averted if those who reap the fruits of industry show the same wisdom in spending their gains as they did in acquiring them, and prove manifestly to the world that wealth in great reservoirs is as beneficial to mankind in general as water similarly stored.

The tendency of modern industry is to be monarchical, in as much as power and profit generally fall into the hands of a few men of genius who have the gift of management, who can understand and control the very complex conditions upon which success in trade depends. It seems an easy thing, indeed, to start a coöperative society upon republican principles, with an equitable distribution of profits; but, as a matter of fact, such undertakings usually tend to degenerate into joint stock companies. The original shares are bought up by a few capitalists and the business, in order to prosper, has to be managed by some captain of industry whose freedom of action is not hampered by the interference of a meddling board. In the world of industry, as in that of politics, a republic is not easily worked on a paper constitution. It must have developed gradually from a vigorous germ. Unfortunately the germ of many a possible industrial republic was ruthlessly choked when the guild system was destroyed at the time of the Reformation. If the ancient guilds had survived, we should, doubtless, have inherited an organic body of industrial laws worthy of the name. As it is, our so-called economic laws are, to a great extent, the working out of natural forces, largely selfish, under very imperfect control.

It is with the spending of wealth rather than its acquisition that we are at present concerned, though the one will react on the

other. Wise expenditure will breed secure profit, but in the wisdom there must be self-denial and the profit will not always be immediate. A great nation acts wisely in securing a market for its goods, but its manner of doing it may be short-sighted and foolish. Its first business is to consult the true interests of its customers and not merely to exploit them, without regard to any other qualities but their buying power. If, in our inconsiderate hurry, we force this up to an untimely maximum, our customers will come to regard us as mere scramblers for wealth and respect us accordingly. It is to be feared that the recent troubles in China are largely due to such an opinion of us as formed by the Chinese. They judge us by our merchants rather than by our missionaries, for the mercantile interest is much better represented than the missionary, so much so that they believe the latter to be in a hypocritical league with the former, with the common object of forcing a Western yoke upon the country. Now, the Chinese understand little of Western civilization, and that little they have not learned to admire or compare favorably with their own. They regard Europeans as little better than barbarians, whose only claim to civilization is that they have developed and organized all the mischievous tendencies in human nature. Our scientific knowledge, our military superiority, our railways, telegraphs and modern appliances are, in their eyes, only signs of a restless and dangerous activity destined to play itself out in the ruin of ourselves and of all who follow our lead. Ours is a one-sided development of our lower faculties at the expense of the higher—the harnessing of physical force, not in the service of true wisdom, but for the overthrow of all stability and the destruction of that root of all blessings—philosophic calm. So they think, and not, it must be confessed, entirely in ignorance. They see the repulsive forces of our civilization which make for disintegration, while the counteracting attractive forces which tend to union and stability have never yet been fairly brought before their view. They see the harmful effects of unrestrained commercialism, but they do not see the steadying influence of Christianity, which acts as a powerful check upon our aggressive worldliness. Hence they conclude that our civilization is verging upon its fall, and unless our Christianity is made to assert itself and prove the stronger of the two forces, who shall say that their conclusion is wrong?

The only way to gain permanent and steady customers in an independent nation, or to exercise a profitable rule over peoples subject to us, is to show them our better side; but for that we must have a better side to show. Now, the theory so common among us that scientific enlightenment and material progress are the sole constituents of true progress is a doctrine

unamiable in itself and commonly seen to be so by the peoples we wish to exploit in our interests. If we sail under the banner of enlightened self-interest, and, after all, this is the most dignified ensign which modern commercialism has to show, we invite suspicion at once. For interests are apt to clash and, however enlightened we may be, it will often be hard to persuade our less intelligent brethren that our interests are also theirs. In that case the persuasion may have to come by force. They will, under pressure, take up our ideas, enter into our industrial system and, be it remarked, imitate our military system also. Enlightenment will come, too, with emancipation from old ideas. They will form new conceptions of their own interests and prepare themselves, in time, to defend them against aggression on our part. In other words, they will join that happy family of the Western world of which every member is on terms of armed neutrality with every other, and so the solidarity of the world will be complete and last until the explosive cement which binds the nations together is ignited by the carelessness of some unwary politician.

If such a universal upheaval ever take place, it seems hardly likely that the white races will come out of the wrack with their supremacy still unquestioned. At present they form an aristocracy in the world, claiming by their mental and moral superiority, and by their scientific employment of physical force, to dictate terms to a majority of dark and yellow races who outnumber them by some three or four to one. It is a fact, however, which stands clearly out in the history of the world that the power of aristocracies tends to decline and to give way to the rule of the multitude, for, as the masses of a nation become wealthier and more enlightened, the conditions of superiority in the ruling class will gradually disappear, and the people, who have the advantage of numbers, claim their full share in the direction of affairs. Now, what is true of any particular nation is likely to be true of the whole family of nations which make up mankind. Numbers will tell in the end. Distinctions founded on education, social or political organization and commercial development will disappear, and the white man will find that, for better or worse, he has educated his less civilized brother up to something very near his own level. It is futile to maintain that the peoples of Asia are incapable of such development or that, if once moved, they may not become as aggressive as ourselves. Facts are dead against such a contention. In the space of a few years Japan has been transformed from its Oriental conservatism into the position of a first-class power which, as for China, those who know the country assure us that the Chinese, in spite of their political stagnation, are physically, mentally and morally superior to the Japanese. Should

time and circumstances enable them to develop their resources and throw life into their structureless probity they will be able to turn the tables upon European interference. In individual fighting power, at any rate, the trained Asiatic is already the equal of the European. He can shoot as straight, die as bravely and endure privations at least as well as his white companion in arms. The time seems not far off when he will find a leader of his own color and be taught to fight for his own hearth. When that day comes, and when he goes to battle with disciplined millions at his back, he may prove to be not merely the equal, but the possible master of his Caucasian rival. The Roman Empire was overwhelmed by the Northern barbarians; Europe was dangerously near meeting the same fate at the hands of the Turks, and there are forces now in reserve which are amply sufficient, under certain conditions, to destroy the whole fabric of our modern civilization.

When Christendom was threatened with destruction by the power of the Ottoman Empire there existed among Christian nations at least an imperfect form of political union which sprang from their common religion. Since then the influence of religion as a bond of union has grown weaker still, while the rivalry existing among the civilized peoples of the West does not tend to decrease. Identity of interest therefore, especially if the spirit of competition be regarded as a national virtue, is not more likely to unite them against a common enemy than it was in the days when Constantinople fell. The power of the foe they may have to face, though it be latent now, is likely to develop into a peril vastly more formidable than that which was threatened by the Ottoman Empire.

Such an outlook as this would, no doubt, be somewhat pessimistic were it not that we have the means to prevent its being realized. That it or something like it is the end to which secularism is tending we are fully persuaded. We are with equal firmness convinced that the Catholic Church is the only force in the world capable of successfully resisting the secularist contagion and its attendant spirit of greedy commercialism, and that it is with Catholics, therefore, that there chiefly lies the responsibility of exerting themselves to meet the dangers ahead. That we possess intrinsically the best means of combating the evil does not necessarily imply that we are actually the best combatants, unless we make the fullest use of the advantages we possess. We have valued allies outside the Church, who are, perhaps, owing to their greater natural resources, doing more for the good cause than we are ourselves. It is for us to work with them in friendly rivalry and show them by overwhelming evidence that our methods, when adequately worked, are those consecrated by heaven for the benefit of mankind.

It is the mission of the Church to take the lead in every good work of widespread utility, to give unity of action to every helpful movement by absorbing its promoters into her system. This is the ideal after which she must strive, and she can only attain it by being better known. The Church, indeed, has always possessed the marks by which she may be known in the world, but it is possible for those marks to become obscured or, on the other hand, to be more and more vividly impressed. It is by what she does rather than by what she teaches, by the results of her teaching rather than by the teaching itself, that men form their estimate of her character. They judge her by the evidence of facts. Now, the evidence of facts may be striking and manifold and yet be ignored by those who from perversity or prejudice lack the will to believe. Statistics may show that Catholic schools turn out a highly creditable percentage of good citizens; that Catholic missioners, with the scantiest means at their disposal, obtain a much better hold on their converts than do the preachers of other religions who are backed by unlimited supplies of money; Catholic social works may meet with unparalleled success; and yet all this array of facts will fail to convince many a man of average prejudice that it is not his duty to detest the Pope of Rome and all his works. Our Lord has said: "Let your light shine before men." If the light is not strong enough we must make it stronger still. If facts are not persuasive we must swell the multitude of them until the evidence they supply is so overwhelming as to convince the minds of all but the most wilfully perverse. For this result we need a quickening of energy in every department of Catholic life; and this can only come from a copious outpouring of the Spirit of God, the well-spring of every true revival. At the back of all fruitful activity is the spirit of prayer and contemplation, which is nothing else than the profound and living possession of Catholic truth. All great movements in the Church have begun with a special interposition of the Holy Ghost in order to stir up this interior spirit, for without it the greatest zeal is apt to dissipate its energy in ill-advised and fruitless ventures. Hence to minimize the value of the interior life, or to question the *raison d'être* of religious orders who pass their time in the cloister, is to despise that very light which alone can guide us and which we, who are active, wish to make to shine before men.

But Christ has entrusted His Church not only with a shining light, but also with a sword: "I came not to bring peace, but the sword." As Catholics we are a militant body whose object is, in a certain sense, to create strife and division. This is a hard truth for our reckoning in these days when we hear so much talk of tolerance and of "live and let live." The wheat and the cockle

grow up in such close fraternity that any attempt to uproot the latter would seem to be an act of mischievous brutality. Yet there can be no compromise between good and evil, and all tolerance of the evil which we can prevent is a betrayal of our trust. Tolerance may be extended to persons, but not to principles. Once a principle is recognized as contrary to the teachings of our Master, it is our duty to combat it with all the energy we possess. If we can root up the cockle without at the same time rooting up the wheat, it is our business to do so without mercy, so as to leave the angels of God as little as possible to do on the final sorting day. If our work is done rightly there will be no need of any heavy-booted aggressiveness; our warfare will be carried on with a humanity undreamt of by the most considerate of Geneva conventions. For, after all, the rallying light and the sword of division which Christ brought into the world are only different aspects of one and the same thing, viz., that unchangeable, knowable truth which He confided to the keeping of His Church. The clearer the light of truth is made to shine before men, the narrower will be the zone of half-light, hesitancy and purblind indifference. Those who have any love for the light will know whither to follow it, while those who love darkness rather than the light will go the opposite way, and so the torch of truth will become the sword of division which definitely separates the world into the two hostile camps of good and evil, light and darkness. But before we can bring matters to this clear and definite issue it will be our duty to live the Catholic life in its fullness, so that the Church may stand before the world as a divine organization in complete working order, inspiring its members with a living knowledge of supernatural truth and, at the same time, inducing them to employ every form of activity which may propagate that truth among others.

There is much truth in the assertion that the weakness of the Church in so many Catholic countries is due to a deadening of the active virtues, to a decline of the militant spirit in Catholics themselves. They have been living in winter quarters while their enemies have been laying waste the country around them. Those whose business it was to be most active have, only too often, contented themselves with complaints and half-hearted prayers to heaven at a time when prompt and organized action was imperatively necessary, when vast numbers of neutrals, who, if gained over in time, might have been turned into active partisans, were going over to the standard of the enemy.

It is true that we are beginning to open our eyes, that the energy of Catholics in many parts of the world gives us every reason to hope for better things, but our period of unnecessary

hibernation is by no means at an end; we cannot yet sing *Jam hiems transiit* (the winter is passed), nor shall we be able to do so until we have emerged from our winter quarters with our minds on the alert, our scouts everywhere afield and our forces ready to converge at the right point. Then, and then only, shall we begin to swell our fighting line from the numbers of those nondescript Christians, half-baked Catholics and hesitating free-thinkers who at present occupy so large a space in what should be Christendom. When these have been gained over and drilled there will then be a real hope of dealing successfully with the vast heathen populations which form the great majority of mankind.

We have already recalled the fact that great movements and revivals in the Catholic world are commonly preceded by some unmistakable sign of Divine interposition, and, indeed, for such a revival as we have described, for such an output of energy all along the line, a very special outpouring of grace would be required. Now, miraculous help does not come at command, but we can prepare ourselves to receive it, and the sort of help we require for the extension of Christ's Church upon earth has been guaranteed to us by Christ Himself provided that we fulfil His conditions. If we labor and pray, if we work as units or in detached sections and make use of what energy we have at our disposal to begin with, He will find a means of coördinating our efforts and will provide a leader to direct them into one general movement. Since, therefore, it is our trading and wealth-gaining energy which is principally active, it follows that we should make our start by employing this, as the Crusaders of old employed their fighting propensities, in ventures hallowed by some relish of salvation. If we are determined to grow rich it must be for the only legitimate object of all riches, which is to promote the glory of God. It is better to be without wealth than to be ignorant of how to use it rightly when acquired; whereas, if we intend to use it as the means to a noble end, the commercial energy by which we acquire it becomes a pursuit worthy of our labor and useful in the best sense to the state as well as to all those with whom we have dealings.

When Christopher Columbus started on his first voyage of discovery the chief object he had in view, after the great and leading purpose of planting the faith in newly found lands, was to acquire gold to pay the expenses of an expedition to the Holy Land. Owing to the greed of his followers and the short-sighted policy of King Ferdinand, his schemes were effectually checked in their very inception, but, in spite of his failure, Columbus will live in history as the example of a saintly man, personally and spiritually poor, in whom the gold fever was so transfigured as to blend its

fire with the purest flame of divine love. He failed because he stood alone. The pioneers who inherited his apostolic spirit, men like Las Casas, St. Peter Claver, Marquette and the missionaries of both Americas, though they met with only partial success, yet showed, by the splendid works they inaugurated, what grand and enduring results would have been achieved had they met with support instead of opposition. There are many works at present in progress for the conversion of our fellow-citizens and for the conversion of heathens. Though many in number, they are few, very few, when compared with the needs they are intended to meet, and most of them are in a struggling condition. Their weakness springs, not so much from actual opposition, though that, at times, is violent enough, but from lack of support in the shape of money contributions.

In the year 1802 the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, which is one of the principal mainstays of the foreign missions, was able to raise, from all parts of the world, no more than $1,300,000, a sum hardly sufficient to pay the third part of the price of a first-class battleship. The contribution sent in from the United States, though it compared favorably with the sums subscribed by other nations, represented something under three-quarters of a cent per head of the Catholic population. In England the principal missionary college, St. Joseph's, Mill Hill, was actually in receipt of a subsidy from the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, and when the allowance was withdrawn it had to struggle hard for its very existence. Catholic France, which has long taken the lead in all apostolic work and made the noblest sacrifices in men and money, is at present so beset with persecution and wholesale robbery at home that she can hardly be expected to maintain her position as the most generous Catholic nation abroad.

If the Church is crippled in France it becomes all the more a matter of supreme necessity that Catholics in other countries should be made keenly alive to the sense of their responsibilities; for it is a want of knowledge rather than the lack of generosity which accounts for the extremely small allowance which is doled out to the foreign missions. Catholics are often generous enough when it is a question of supporting a voluntary school or of building a church at home, but the soul of a Chinaman or a Matabele would seem to be such a shadowy entity that the ransom of it is hardly worth the price we pay for a cooling draught in the summer. The neglect of apostolic work abroad is sometimes seriously defended on the plea that what is sent into heathen lands is lost at home. In answer to such ignorant reasoning we will quote some words spoken by Cardinal Manning in a speech delivered before a meeting

held in favor of St. Joseph's Foreign Missionary College in the year 1877:

It is because we have need of men and means at home that I am convinced we ought to send both men and means abroad. In exact proportion as we freely give what we have freely received will our works at home prosper and the zeal and number of our priests be multiplied. This is the test and the measure of Catholic life amongst us. The missionary spirit is the condition of growth; and if the faith is to be extended at home, it must be by our aiding to carry it abroad. To say that we are overwhelmed with local claims and with home wants, and that the money expended for the Foreign Missionary College had better be spent on the spiritual destitution at our own doors, is the most shallow and the most miserable of delusions.

From the earliest times it has been the claim of the true Church to call herself "Catholic," and the title was everywhere acknowledged. In the words of Cardinal Newmann:[2] "Balaam could not keep from blessing the ancient people of God; and the whole world, heresies inclusive, were irresistibly constrained to call God's second election by its prophetical title of the 'Catholic' Church." Yet we meet with certain members of the Anglican and Protestant Episcopalian churches who, to the no small offense of their Protestant co-religionists, persist in calling themselves Catholics, and no amount of logic can convince them that they have no claim to the title. The one argument they need is that of facts, and we must produce overwhelming evidence to show them that it is the Church of Peter alone which has the essentially Catholic property of universal vigorous growth. Now, mission statistics prove that in the work of Christianizing pagans a Catholic dollar will go very much farther than a Protestant dollar, and the difference would be very remarkable indeed were it not for the fact that the Protestant dollars flow far more freely than the Catholic. It is true, of course, that our separated brethren have a greater abundance of this world's goods to bestow on what they consider to be the best of objects; but we ought not to be outdone by them in generosity. In a work of such importance we are called upon to give not merely of our abundance, but of our moderate competence and even of our poverty. The wealth we so bestow will come back to us a thousandfold. The development of our missions will be so great as to drive all rivals from the field, not by force of unfriendly aggression, but because they will find their occupation gone; while the effect at home of such an object lesson will be to gather into the true fold all those earnest seekers after truth who have failed hitherto to see the light because we did not hold it up before their eyes.

And at this stage of our essay it may be well to point the moral of what has already been said about the possible future of the colored races, especially those of the Mongolian stock whose attitude

[2] "Development of Christian Doctrine," ch. vi., sec. 2, p. 6.

towards us is already designated by many as "The Yellow Peril." In view of the terrible possibilities which threaten us, the speedy awakening of a generous spirit among us becomes a matter which concerns not only the growth of true religion, but the very existence of civilization itself. Civilization is threatened from within and from without. The spirit of secularism is weakening those religious and moral safeguards which are the only bonds of our civil society. While pretending to aim at universal solidarity through the motive of enlightened self-interest, it is, in reality, dividing every nation into hostile sections, setting one civilized nation against another, and so poisoning the leaven of Western ideas that our contact with the races of Asia and Africa is the brewing of danger to ourselves instead of being the means of uniting the whole world into one peaceful family of nations. If old-fashioned faith and apostolic zeal are not strong within us, at any rate the thought of dangers ahead ought to impress us with a sense of the position which, as Catholics, we hold in the world. All the signs of the times tend to show that the Protestant system, never firmly united, is beginning to break up altogether. It will soon be powerless to resist the forces of infidelity and secularism which it has done so much to call into existence, while its inevitable disruption, though adding new members and fresh vigor to the Church, will also contribute largely to the forces arrayed against her. It is then that Catholicism will have to stand alone against the spirit of irreligion which is not only warring against Christianity at home, but establishing its outposts in pagan countries as well. If we are to be ready for the struggle we must be ready to make sacrifices now. We, too, must strengthen our outposts and promote the growth of our missions abroad. They are our colonies, whose interests are our interests and who will stand by us in the day of trial. A colonial policy may not always be advantageous to a nation, but it is essential to the Church. Her health and the fullness of her life at home depend upon the measure in which she spreads herself abroad, while we see that, if the Church is weak at home, the very existence of our present civilization will be at stake. If in pagan countries the merchant is not closely followed by the missionary; if, what is worse still, and what has actually taken place in Japan, modern infidel philosophy is more actively propagated than Catholic teaching; if, in short, we carry to our fellow-men the gospel of Mammon and of intellectual pride instead of teaching them Christian humility and charity, we shall be furnishing them with weapons which they may use to overwhelm us when they have learned to know their own power. The trader who sells rifles to the African savage is far less a traitor to his own cause than the statesman who exports

Western ideas and Western commodities without the necessary corrective of Christian teaching.

A Christian China and a Christian India would make for the solidarity of the world with the strength of two vast populations, including, perhaps, one-half of the human race, who would be ready to acknowledge their indebtedness to Western Christendom for their social, intellectual and religious emancipation. If, on the other hand, the work of emancipation is inaugurated by selfish commercialism, they will see no reason for gratitude towards us when our one object has been to exploit them as a lucrative market for our wares. We may enrich a semi-barbarous nation by developing its resources and organizing its finance. Its people, no doubt, will grow in material prosperity under our directing influence, but their obligations to us will be of a strictly business nature and no more. We, too, shall have drawn our profit out of their expansion and reaped thereby a sufficient reward. They will have given us our wages of management, and, as soon as they are able to sever the connection, they will dispense with our services and set up for themselves in opposition to us.

The smallness of the Catholic leaven in the East, the insignificance of the results we have achieved compared with what yet remains to be done, may be gathered from a few facts. The Paris Society of Foreign Missions is the largest missionary association in the world. In the near East and in the far East, from Southern India to Japan, Korea and Manchuria, it has 32 dioceses or vicariates apostolic. Its 1,236 European, assisted by 625 native priests, minister to the wants of 1,300,491 Catholics. The actual conversions of the year among adult pagans numbered 34,587, while 133,934 children of pagan parents were baptized. These figures, to be sure, in so far as they present to us the picture of an active and well organized society making the most of the means at its disposal, are very consoling. But when we consider the vast populations among whom the missioners work and the fact that hardly any men of influence have yet embraced the faith, the impression so far made by Christianity seems very slight indeed. In Japan, among a population of 40,000,000, there are less than 50,000 Catholics.

In the British Empire the propagation of the Gospel among heathen peoples is left entirely to private enterprise, so that Catholics, who form so small a proportion of the home population, are able to do but little for their pagan fellow subjects. English Catholic missionaries are very few in number, so that nearly all the work of evangelization has to be done by foreigners, mostly French and Belgians. However, even in England itself something is being done to train laborers for missionary work in the empire. St.

Joseph's Society for Foreign Missions has obtained a footing in Kashmir, Madras, Borneo, New Zealand and Uganda. This last named mission, the most successful of all, was begun in 1895 at the special request of Mgr. Livinhac, the successor of Cardinal Lavigerie. He had come to England to represent to Cardinal Vaughan how necessary it was that English missioners should be sent to Equatorial Africa in order to dispel the lie so industriously spread among the natives that the Catholic religion was purely French, and that to be under British protection they must become Protestants. The sacrifices made in undertaking the work were soon well repaid, and at present the fathers of the mission have under their charge a large Catholic population who are loyal to the faith and who have, moreover, proved their loyalty to the government in times of extreme danger. Should this mission be well supported by the generosity of English-speaking Catholics, it is likely to have a great future before it and to compete on advantageous terms with the Protestant missions which are likewise carrying on an active propaganda in the African lake district.

The Zambesi Mission in Southern Africa can claim the honorable distinction of having obtained a footing among the savage Matabele, ruled over by Lo Bengula, just ten years before the British South African Company established its sphere of interest in and about the territories of that monarch. These ten years were indeed a period of weary waiting and hardships. In an account of the first pioneer expedition written by Fr. Arkwright, S. J.,[3] we read as follows:

> The first batch of missioners consisted of eight fathers and three lay brothers. . . . . It was in Father Depelchin's plan to establish stations along the line of march, but as he made headway into the interior he got news of the death of one father, then another, one brother, then another. . . . . Another set of missioners, headed by Father Croonenberghs, went to their help and were dispersed over the country. These, too, had their trials. Father Wehl got astray, missed the track of the wagon, was lost in the bush and was only found a month after completely out of his mind. He died soon after. A lay brother was lost in Crocodile river. Father Law died of starvation, Father Perörde and Father Fuchs died of fever. Father de Witt fell from his horse and died on the spot. . . . . Finally, Father Depelchin, who had broken his leg during the journey, came back to the colony, on his way to Europe to give an account of his expedition and the hopes he had of the mission. . . . . Father Prestage was in Lo Bengula's country for ten years or so, but made little or no progress with the blacks, on account of the despotic rule of the king.
>
> Truly, before the country was opened up by the new chartered company things did look black indeed, and poor Father Weld (the superior's) heart seemed to be sinking, but when he saw the fortune hunters and gold-seekers themselves taking the thing in hand, he beheld all their endeavors in a supernatural light and gave sincere thanks to God for His wonderful providence, and on his death-bed his one great thought was that at last the time was come for the conversion of the poor abandoned creatures on the Zambesi.

The advantage of having been first in the field, ten years before the advent of the traders and gold-seekers, though it showed how helpless missioners may sometimes be without the aid of these

[3] See the *Month*, January, 1893, "The Zambesi Mission."

latter, was by no means a mere shadowy gain. The promise that those who sow in tears shall reap in joy began to be fulfilled in the general respect shown by natives and Europeans alike for these self-sacrificing apostles who had proved by their example that the heart of the white man can feel a nobler and more burning thirst than the thirst for gold. The Zambesi Mission, which is worked by the Fathers of the Society of Jesus, has now some eight or nine stations among the Kaffirs, Matabele and Mashonas. The future is fraught with great possibilities, but their realization will depend, under God, upon the generosity of the faithful at home. At the present moment, while the new country of Rhodesia is being opened out and things are in a state of transition, any liberal and energetic support is likely to produce speedy and lasting results. If, through lack of this support the missioners lose the position they have so heroically gained, the difficulties of the future may grow beyond remedy, while the labors and lives of men that were sown on the African veldt will fail to produce that hundred-fold harvest which is their proper recompense.

It is only fair to say here that the generosity of American Catholics has had no small share in the establishment and progress of the two missions of which we have sketched this short account. It is true that America has much noble apostolic work to support nearer home, but then the number of English Catholics is so small and their resources are so scanty compared with the tasks they have to perform that they are obliged to seek for liberal help from abroad.[4]

In South Africa the solution of the "Color Question" will probably depend upon the particular way in which the natives are Christianized. Whatever we may think of the good intentions of those concerned in producing him, the Methodized or Anglicanized Negro can hardly be reckoned a success. But too often he hides the vices of the black and the white man under a thin veneer of Christianity, and the only efficacious appeal to his sense of duty is that which comes from physical force. It is the Catholic missionaries who from experience and long tradition know best how to deal with the African savage according to his character, which is that of a long-neglected child who must be ruled with a firm hand while he is

[4] It may not, perhaps, be unpractical in this connection to mention the addresses to which communications respecting the two missions of St. Joseph and the Zambesi may be sent. In the former case letters should be addressed to the rector, Father Henry, St. Joseph's College, Mill Hill, London, N. W. Those for the Zambesi mission should be sent to the Rev. F. King, S. J., Manresa House, Roehampton, London, S. W., or to the Rev. M. R. McCarthy, S. J., St. Francis Xavier's College, 130 West Sixteenth street, New York city.

treated with all the consideration which the value of his immortal soul demands. Whatever be the political and social future that lies before him, whether he be destined to live in independence or to remain forever under the influence of his white brother, in any case it is altogether desirable that he should be first raised to the moral and spiritual level marked out in the Gospel. Since Christ died to redeem men of every color and has provided the means of regeneration for all men, however degraded they may be, there no longer exists any charter of Josue for settling race questions by the policy of extermination. The black man is destined to remain as a power in the world. In his own land of Africa the problem presented by him in the future will indeed be difficult to solve unless there be extended to him the full benefit of the Christian law of charity. In all probability Africa will remain the black man's land, though the white man will have a mighty influence in the shaping of its future. If the work of transforming its degraded heathen populations is not carried on according to the principles of the Gospel, the Dark Continent will become darker still, and the principal effect of our development of its resources will be to call forth all the latent energy of its indolent millions and let it loose for deeds of blood and violence. In Africa as in Asia events are marching with astounding rapidity, and in each case we are on our trial before heaven and before mankind now more than ever we were in the past. Posterity will have to pay dearly for every false step that we make, while heaven is waiting for that golden harvest the seeds of which it is now in our power to sow.

Enough has been said to point out in what true economy in the employment of wealth consists. Much more might be said about the numerous ways of wasting riches when they are regarded either as an end in themselves or as the means of living in idleness and luxury. It is sufficient to have indicated that in the end the most wasteful and dangerous method of using our resources is to lay them out for speedy returns by trying to convert the whole world into an economic hot-bed and its people into buyers and sellers who worship no god but Mammon. If wealth is a dangerous possession, easily employed in the service of evil and commonly smoothing the way to headlong decadence, it still remains in itself a good gift of God, though its ownership involves heavy responsibilities. That the weight of these responsibilities may be recognized and nobly borne, we have seen that a crusade of wealth is a need of the times which clamors to be realized. If such a crusade ever assumes the form of a powerful and widespread movement, there can be no doubt that heaven will provide leaders to organize it and give it its proper direction. Meanwhile it is for those who are alive to their own

responsibilities and know where needs are urgent to start the movement betimes by preaching and by generous example, and so to kindle a flame of enthusiasm which shall spread to all such as are ready to sacrifice labor and money when once they know where their true advantage lies.

James Kendal, S. J.

St. Ignatius' College, Malta.

FEUDALISM, CHIVALRY AND THE COMMUNES IN THE MIDDLE AGE.

ELSEWHERE we have had occasion to describe the prime origin of Feudalism, when we spoke of the influence of the Germanic and Slavic barbarian invasions on general society in the disrupted Roman Empire.[1] Now we would remark that many publicists imagine that they discern the origin of the feudal system among the Romans of the time of the Empire; and simply because they find an analogy between the relations of mediæval suzerain and vassal and those relations which subsisted between his patron and the Roman soldier who had received a gift of lands with the obligation of defending their possession in the name of that patron. It appears certain, however, that as a definite system Feudalism was of Teutonic origin, although it speedily became the presumed governmental ideal also among the Latin, as well as among the Gallic and the other Celtic peoples. The reader should note that the Saxons and Vandals were the sole barbarians who interfered with the olden municipal régime of the Roman law; and he should not forget that in their treatment of the civilized landowners in the whilom Roman Empire, the Germanic and Slavic barbarians acted in accordance with their respective and comparative ideas of decency and of justice. The Germans, properly so-called, appropriated every inch of arable soil in Gaul and Italy which they could dominate, relegating the owners to a serfdom which was yet to be mollified by the influence of the Church. The Vandals contented themselves with the best of the farms, of course reducing the legitimate proprietors to serfdom. The Burgundians were satisfied with a confiscation of two-thirds of the fertile acres, on which the olden proprietors were thenceforth allowed to find a living with pick and hoe. The Franks, however—as if in prognostication of the

[1] Our "Universal History," Vol. I., p. 532.

future *Gesta Dei per Francos*—occupied merely those lands which appeared to have no owners. All of these confiscated "fiefs" were donatives from the barbaric chieftains; and from the fifth until the ninth century there were manifested continually two tendencies—one, on the part of the lords, to take back the granted estates so that the said lords might procure more adherents by new investitures, and another on the part of the original barbaric vassals who constantly yearned for an exemption from every obligation toward their lords. Ere long three thoroughly antagonistic systems confronted each other—the monarchical, the aristocratic and the democratic. Perhaps we should not use the term "democratic" in this connection, but there is no other word capable of indicating the position which was occupied by that "Third Estate" which was already prominent in the ninth century. During the reigns of Pepin and Charlemagne the monarchical idea obtained a predominance. In the Italy of that time anarchy was prevalent. In the glorious peninsula of Spain, the pride of the hidalgos—that pride which caused even the king to bend before it—made the monarch a mere military chief. In England, after the precarious reigns of the Anglo-Saxon and Danish monarchs, those of the Norman-French kings were a continual struggle with their recalcitrant barons.

A few words must now be devoted to the feudal hierarchy. At the head of Christian society, the *populus Christianus*, was the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Our Lord and Saviour, the supreme arbitrator in the differences among rulers, the suzerain of many of the kings, and upon whom devolved the duty of selecting the prince who was to be the "Holy Roman Emperor"—a personage who, despite his grandiose title, had no real jurisdiction over other States than those of which he was the king. In the feudal system there was a triple tie between the suzerain and the vassal—the *homagium*, the *fides* and the *investitura* or *saisine;* and this tie was to be renewed at the accession of a new vassal. By the act of *homagium*, as the term indicates, the vassal declared that he was the "man" of his lord; and the avowal was accomplished by the placing of the vassal's hand in that of his superior. By the act of *fides*, the vassal swore fidelity to his lord. But not until the vassal had received the *investitura*, symbolized by a twig or a bit of clay, did the vassal know that his tenure was secure. The obligations of the vassal to his suzerain were both material and moral, the material being chiefly military, while the moral entailed the respect and defense of the honor of every member of his superior's family. Undoubtedly, as in all human institutions, there were many imperfections in the feudal system; but we must say with Chantrel: "In

the days of Feudalism there could exist no such oppression as had been organized by the Roman Senate and which was to be established by that of Venice. Great conquests and great dominations were impossible. Anarchy was forestalled, and ambition was arrested ere it could develop. The despotism of one person was seldom actuated."[2]

Not until the eleventh century was the feudal system in full force; the fourteenth century saw its end, although the twelfth had beheld a lessening of its influence because of the growth of the Communes and of the royal power. Feudalism spread itself over all those countries which had formed the empire of Charlemagne; that is, over France, Italy, Germany and Northern Spain. In its improved condition the Normans introduced it into England. Quite naturally, its adoption followed every Christian conquest over the Mussulman encampers on Spanish soil. The Scandinavian kingdoms welcomed it in the twelfth century; Russia in the thirteenth. The enterprising Crusaders transplanted it to their conquests in the Orient. Coming now to a general view of feudal Europe as it subsisted in the halcyon days of the much-discussed system, France claims our chief consideration. At the time when the Capetian dynasty attained the throne of France, the royal domain consisted of the *Ile* which was termed the Duchy of France, and of the Orleanais, the counties of Laon and Bourges and the Vexin. The immediate vassals of the king were the nine secular peers: the dukes of Normandy, Burgundy, Aquitaine and Gascony, and the counts of Anjou, Flanders, Champagne, Toulouse and Barcelona. There were also six ecclesiastical peers: the archbishop-duke of Reims, the bishops-dukes of Laon and Langres, and the counts-bishops of Beauvais, Chalons and Noyons. In the twelfth century the secular peerages were reduced to six: those of the duchies of Normandy, Burgundy and Aquitaine, and of the counties of Champagne, Toulouse and Flanders. The duchy (once the kingdom) of Aquitaine was bounded by the Loire, the Lower Rhone, the Pyrenees and the Atlantic. It comprised the county (destined to become the kingdom) of Navarre, the duchy of Gascony, the counties of Comminges, Bigorre, Armagnac, Toulouse, Roussillon, Barcelona, Foix, Poitiers, Auvergne, Angoulème, Périgord, La Marche and Bourges; the viscounties of Bearn, Turenne and Narbonne; the barony (in time the duchy) of Bourbon; the lordship (afterward the duchy) of Albret, and the lordship of Montpellier. Bounded by the Mediterranean, the Alps, the Lower Rhone, the Loire, the Jura, Champagne and Lorraine were the territories which once formed the ancient kingdom of Burgundy and Arles, and during many years

[2] "Cours d'Histoire Universelle, Moyen Age," Paris, 1886.

of the Middle Age these fiefs acknowledged the suzerainty of the Holy Roman Emperor, although it is to be noted that quasi-independence was the portion of many of the bishops in those regions. The northern provinces—Artois, Flanders and Picardy—depended from the French crown, as did also in the northwest Normandy, Maine, Anjou and Brittany, together with many counties. The olden kingdom of Lorraine, between the Rhone and the Meuse, comprising the territory known in our day as Alsace-Lorraine, depended from the Empire.

As for the Holy Roman Empire, we should never forget that two distinct personalities must always be discerned in its incumbent—the king of the Germans and the suzerain of the northern and central Italian princes (the Pope excepted) and of the northern and central Italian communes. The great vassals of the king of the Germans were the dukes of the two Lorraines, the dukes of Franconia, Suabia, Bavaria, Carinthia, Bohemia and Saxony, and those ecclesiastical princes whom Otho I. had endowed with secular dominion. The administration of the kingdom of Italy, on the part of the Holy Roman Emperor, was entirely distinct from that of the Germans. Until the eleventh century feudal nobles such as marquises and counts acted as a species of imperial vicars in the chief cities of the north and centre (Rome excepted), Magna Græcia still recognizing the sovereignty of Constantinople. Finally, counts were established in nearly every town which admitted the imperial suzerainty. However, the enfranchisement of the Lombard Communes, together with the rise of the Italian commercial republics, banished Feudalism from the greater cities in the north and centre of the peninsula. When, toward the end of the eleventh century, the Normans effected their domination of the Two Sicilies, they established feudal institutions firmly, and vestiges of those institutions are still perceptible in the island and in Calabria.

Among the Spaniards the royal authority was restricted by Feudalism to an extreme and nearly absurd degree. It is certain that had its exaggerations not been too frequently actuated, the Islamites would have returned for all time to Africa several centuries before the days of Ferdinand and Isabella. During the feudal period Spanish vassals of superior degree were styled *ricos hombres,* but this term should be understood as indicative of influential rather than of wealthy men. Now, in one of the *fueros viejos* (olden privileges) of the old Castilian law we read: "If the king exiles one of his vassals who is a *rico home,* all of the vassals and friends of that exile can accompany him. A *rico home* can change his lord whenever he desires; he needs merely to send a representative to his lord of the time, and he is freed from his obligations

when the messenger has said, 'My lord, I kiss your hands in the name of my own lord, and I announce that he is no longer your vassal.'" We must feel some enthusiasm when we remember that every mediæval Spaniard regarded himself as noble from the fact that he had received Baptism. But prudence was certainly disregarded when the kings of Aragon, on the day of their coronation, allowed themselves to be thus addressed: "Sire, taken one by one, each of us is your equal. United, we are stronger than you are; remember, therefore, that we make you our king only on condition that you respect our privileges." Feudalism is said by some to have been introduced primarily into England by her Norman conquerors; but Lingard opines that its germs were discernible among the Anglo-Saxons long before the extinction of their dynasty, and he quotes Asser, tutor of Alfred the Great, in proof of the assertion that the term "vassal" was used in England during the reign of that monarch. Asser speaks of the thanes of Somerset as "*nobiles vassalli Sumertunensis plagæ.*"

Probably the fundamental weakness of the feudal system is to be found in the fact that it was in the power of any vassal to become a suzerain. By the concession of a portion of his lands he could become the "lord" of the beneficiary, and therefore in every practical sense a sovereign, while the secondary vassals—the *arrière vassaux*—came to regard him as their suzerain, forgetting quite conveniently their real obligations to the monarch who was the sovereign of the nation. But as an offset to this fundamental weakness we must mention one source of strength in Feudalism. No taxes could be levied without the consent of the contributors. No law was valid if it had not been accepted by those who were to be affected by it. No sentence was legitimate unless it was rendered by the peers of the accused. The average student of history is prone to reflect on the many instances of oppression which he finds in the feudal system. But he should not forget that since the disappearance of feudal institutions history has been at least as redolent of tyranny and outrage as it was when those institutions were dominant. And let us reflect on a very salient fact in connection with this much decried system. It may be thanked for the creation of a very numerous class of men who were ever ready to defend their rights. These men were proud of a common equality, whether they were monarchs or not; they were ever watchful for the moment when their suzerains would justify them in an abjuration of the feudal tie. Nor should moderns forget that besides the principle of individual independence, Feudalism bequeathed to our time other very important principles—the sentiment of honor and that of reciprocal duty, respect for woman, love of domestic life, courtesy

and every other kind of social refinement—in fine, that chivalry which now demands our consideration.[3]

It has been debated whether chivalry, as we have been accustomed to fancy it, ever really existed, or whether, like the golden age, it is not a pretty dream. Cantù, to whom no modern author can be compared for accurate appreciation of the spirit of the Middle Age, reminds us that even in the so-called halcyon days of chivalry the contemporary writers were wont to lament the glories of the olden time and to decry the presumed decay of the lauded institution. And the following remarks of this incomparable historian are very much to the point: "We may well believe that the chivalry of the romances—that is, an era of valor, of loyalty, of spontaneous order, of real happiness, of disinterested sacrifice, of chaste love—no more existed than did the idyllic blessedness of the Arcadian shepherds. Probably books have modified this condition, substituting an ideal for the true era. Nevertheless, there was considerable reality in chivalry, and its members formed an efficient organization, with initiatory forms, rights and prerogatives. Its principal theatre was the south of France, whence it spread throughout Spain, whose people were already chivalrous by nature. Italy, devoted to commerce, religion and science, cared but little for the punctilios of chivalry, unless in the Sicilies, where it was introduced by the Normans. The Suabians wondered that the Hungarians ignored this institution, and they urged, in the name of woman, that the Hungarians should fight with the sword and not with less courteous weapons, but the envoy was soundly scourged. England, more aristocratic than chivalrous, shows us only Richard Cœur de Leon, and he was formed to the arms and poetry of France; the heroes of the Round Table lived merely in the pages of romance; Edward III. and the Black Prince derived all of their renown from the tutelage of France. The Greeks and the Russians never had a conception of chivalry, but its institutions penetrated into Poland."[4]

As a social institution, chivalry dated from the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century, and it was the influence of the Catholic Church that endowed it with all of its estimable qualities. As for its faults—ever concomitants of all the devices of man—most of them were due to the still surviving barbaric tendencies

[3] For accurate details in regard to Feudalism consult: Beaumanoir, "Livre des Coustumes de Beauvoisis," written in 1283, but printed at Bourges in 1690 and at Paris in 1843; Brussel, "Usage des Fiefs," Paris, 1750; Cantù, "Storia Universale," Bk. XI., chap. xii. Ninth Italian edition, Turin, 1866; Romain, "Le Moyen Age," Paris, 1890; Tocqueville, "L'Ancien Régime et la Revolution," Paris, 1856; Orlando, "Feudi di Sicilia," Palermo, 1817; Lingard, "History of England," Vol. I., London, 1830; Guizot, "Histoire de la Civilisation en France," Lect. 40, Paris, 1830.

[4] *Ubi supra*, chap. iv.

in the not yet perfectly consolidated *populus Christianus*. The word "chivalry," like every other word in modern languages which indicates any notion of refinement, is derived either from the French or the Italian idiom. Both the French *chevalier* and the Italian *cavaliere* signified originally a man who fought on horseback. As a military force cavalry was unknown to the Germanic and Slavonic hordes who disrupted the Roman Empire, and for several centuries after the great invasion, all operations of war in Europe were conducted by infantry. It is true that the Merovingian kings had in their employ a number of fighting horsemen, but these were all Gallo-Romans, and it seems that unfortunately their worth in battle was not appreciated at its full value. Not until the accession of the Carlovingian dynasty was any great consideration accorded to cavalry; then every warrior who was sufficiently rich to buy and feed a horse insisted on entering the field as a "chevalier." Hence it came to pass that this term was in time regarded as a title of honor —in fact, as indicative of a new institution. Then the Church, ever on the alert to Christianize every proper enterprise of her children, undertook the task of consecrating the chevaliers to her own defense and to that of the weak and the poor. Almost from the origin of this institution there were two kinds of chevaliers, religious and secular. The secular knight was devoted to the service of his sovereign or to that of his feudal suzerain; the religious knight received an investiture from his bishop, the ceremony consisting of a blessing of a sword which was never to be drawn unless in the cause of God or in that of the oppressed. As a rule the chevalier underwent an apprenticeship. While still a child he was sent to the household of his sovereign or to that of his suzerain, there to act as *varlet* or *damoiseau*, according as his service was given to the lord or to the lady of the castle—to the *castellan* or to the *chatellaine*. When he had attained to the age of fourteen the boy was supposed to be *hors de page*, or graduated from his novitiate. If then he was found to be all that religion and courtesy demanded, he was admitted to the grade of *ecuyer* or "squire," which entitled him to the privilege of carrying the shield of his lord. Seven years were then spent in study and in military exercises ere the lad could hope to be admitted to the ranks of chivalry; at the expiration of this period, if his conduct had met with the approval of his lord and of his lady, he was "dubbed" a knight.

Certain moderns smile when they happen to peruse a description of the ceremonies which inducted the candidate into his probably glorious career. But the thoroughly Catholic reader will agree with our opinion that such ceremonies could appropriately signalize an initiation into the real and so-called Catholic societies of our

day. After a bath, a symbol of purification, the youth was shorn of those tresses which had been his own pride as well as that of his mother and sisters, and he donned a white robe as a symbol of that chastity which, in accordance with his married or unmarried state, he swore to observe. Then he assumed a red garment, which indicated that he vowed to shed his blood, if necessary, in the cause of the Church and in that of the orphan and friendless. An absolute fast from food and drink during the ensuing twenty-four hours then followed as a preparation for the candidate's *veille des armes*, which was a night spent in solitary prayer before the Blessed Sacrament in order that the grace of God would make him a worthy knight. After this solemn vigil the youth made his confession, received his Sacramental Lord and then he left the holy edifice as a chevalier. Another ceremony followed, but it was purely civil. The new knight bowed before his suzerain in order to receive the *accolade* or sword tap on the shoulder, which was accompanied with these words: "In the name of God Almighty, of St. Michael and of St. George I create you a chevalier. Be brave and loyal!"

When we consider the deep significance of these ceremonies, and when we reflect that every modern European sovereign knows full well that Christian knighthood implies devotion to the Catholic faith on the part of its recipient, we are filled with righteous indignation when we hear that orders of chivalry are continually bestowed upon Mohammedans, Freemasons and other infidels by the royal head of the Church of England, by that king of Sardinia who is temporarily installed in the Papal Palace of the Quirinal, and by other rulers who at least proclaim themselves as Christians. The absurdity of which these would-be conferrers of knighthood are guilty is evinced by the vows which the chevalier was obliged to take: 1. To die rather than abandon the Holy Roman, Catholic, Apostolic Church. 2. To be ever loyal to his suzerain. 3. To protect the weak. 4. To never offend another intentionally and to never appropriate the goods of another. 5. To always act from motives of virtue and real glory rather than from any hope of pecuniary or other perishable reward. 6. To regard the honor of his fellow-chevaliers as his own. 7. To combat always *en bonne guerre*, that is, to use no contemptible trickery on the field. 8. To never utter a falsehood. 9. When on military duty, to never lay aside his weapons unless for necessary ablutions or sleep. 10. To sacrifice his life in defense of any female who might claim his protection. 11. To pay a proper ransom if he were captured in war, and if he were to find it impossible to raise the sum when he returned to his home, to surrender himself to the enemy. A dereliction from any of these duties entailed the mark of "felony" upon a chevalier;

heralds proclaimed him as such and as a "miscreant," and he was placed on a bier, carried to a church, and there he listened to his obsequies. Thenceforth he was an outcast, practically dead to the world.

The obligations of a chevalier were onerous, but his privileges were great. In France, Italy and Spain the knights were always addressed as "my lord;" their wives bore the title of "my lady"—*dame, signora, senora*—a designation then not given even to noble-women whose husbands were not chevaliers. A place at the royal table was accorded to a knight, although such honor was denied to every member of the royal family who had not received his spurs. An army could be commanded only by a chevalier; among the chevaliers royal ambassadors were exclusively chosen. It must not be forgotten, however, that there were two grades of knighthood; namely, the *bacheliers* or inferior chevaliers and the "bannerets." The latter alone could display their banners at the points of their lances and over the towers of their castles; and no others could aspire to such dignities as marquisates, countships, etc. The period of the Crusades was the heroic age of chivalry. Then the natural emulation between the secular knights and the military religious orders was a benefit to both classes. The decadence of chivalry began shortly after the demise of St. Louis IX., the *beau ideal* of a Christian knight. However, this decadence was not precipitate, for even in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries there flourished many such knights as Duguesclin and Bayard. That the institution of chivalry, the theme of innumerable poets and romancists, rendered inestimable service to civilization cannot be denied. There is scarcely a feature of modern taste or refinement which does not owe its existence to the halcyon days when chivalry was vivified by the Church.[5]

Contemporary with the halcyon days of feudalism and of chivalry was the rise of an institution most antagonistic to the former and not very friendly to the latter. We allude to the Mediæval Communes. The disruption of the Roman Empire did not entail an entire disappearance of municipal government; especially in the south of Gaul the cities retained much of their independence and of their consequent privileges, nor did Feudalism entirely destroy this autonomy. The word "commune" is naturally malodorous to those whom it reminds of that Masonic ebullition which disgraced and

[5] Cantù, *ubi supra;* Michieli y Marquez, "Thesoro Militar de Cavaleria," Madrid, 1642; Giustiniani (Bernardo), "Historie Chronologiche degli Ordini Militari," Venice, 1692; San Sovino, "Dell' Origine dei Cavalieri," Venice, 1583; Menestrier, "La Chevalerie Ancienne et Moderne," Paris, 1683; La Curne de Saint-Palaye, "Mémoires sur l'Ancienne Chevalerie," Paris, 1781; Mills, "History of Chivalry," London, 1825.

nearly ruined France and all but destroyed Paris in 1871; but the Communes of the Middle Age were sources of political and commercial prosperity for their citizens. Their prime origin must be ascribed to the laudable pride of those cities in the north of Italy which struggled against the tyranny of those kings of the Germans upon whom a Roman Pontiff had unfortunately placed the crown of the Holy Roman Empire which the Frankish Charlemagne had worn most worthily. The word "commune," which denoted merely an enlarged family, was adopted in France, in the Low Countries and in England as a name for the many free mediæval municipalities in those lands. The term was simply a translation of *communitas*, just as in Italy the corresponding idea was generally represented by *republica*, an adaptation of the Latin term *res publica*. The majority of these municipalities were instituted in the eleventh century; in the thirteenth, that century which was the most mediæval of all, according to the prevalent acceptation of the term, they were at the height of their prosperity. It is well to note that the very "unclerical" Guizot, supposing that a *bourgeois* of the twelfth century might visit one of the great cities of modern Europe, emits the following reflections: "The stranger inquires as to how the government is administered, and as to the condition of the people. He learns that outside the limits of the city there is a power which taxes the citizens at will, and that the said power forces them into its armies. He hears some talk of magistrates and of a mayor, but he is told that the affairs of the municipality are regulated from a distance. This *bourgeois* of the twelfth century, accustomed to a different state of things, is mute with astonishment. Now let the scene change! Suppose that a Frenchman of the nineteenth century could enter a city of the Middle Age! He would find himself indeed in a fortified place, but its defenders would be the citizens themselves. These citizens would tax themselves; they would elect their own magistrates and judges; they would meet in order to debate on public matters. They governed themselves; in a word, they were sovereigns."[6] Each of the Communes had its mayor, its aldermen, its municipal seal for all communal documents, and what we would term a national guard. As the formula of their rights was generally couched, these rights composed those of *scabinatus* (the right of having aldermen) of *collegium* (that of investing certain notables with police authority) of *majoratus* (that of choosing their mayors), of *sigillum* (that of having their own official seals), of *campana* and *berfredus* (that of bell and belfry whereby the citizens could be summoned to arms) and that of jurisdiction, a term which explains itself. Augustin Thierry well says: "At the commence-

[6] "Histoire de France," Paris, 1823.

ment of the fourteenth century, when for the first time the deputies of the *bourgeoisie* of France were called to the States General of the kingdom, the command was no sign that the *bourgeois* had been recently emancipated; for more than two centuries had elapsed since that numerous class had conquered its liberty and had fully enjoyed it. Therefore the convocation of the deputies of the Third Estate was not a political favor; it was a recognition of the olden communal privileges. In fact, the recognition coincided with the first violations of these privileges and with the first attempts to rob the Communes of their independence of organization."[7] In France, especially in its central portion, there were, besides the Communes properly so-called, many privileged cities and towns which were termed *villes bourgeoises;* for instance, Paris and Orleans. Despite their name, all the inhabitants of these *villes bourgeoises* were not *bourgeois* or citizens; very many were simply *manants* or *habitants* who could obtain the rights of citizenship only by purchase or by special merit. These cities and burgs held their charters directly from the monarch, and hence it was that they enjoyed greater security and more internal tranquillity than were the lot of most of the Communes, although, as an offset to these advantages, their independence was less pronounced than that of the latter. Their magistrates were supervised by a royal provost who presided over the tribunals in the name of the king, regulating the taxes and promulgating the laws. The existence of the Communes and of the *villes bourgeoises* was of great profit to the royal authority in France, since they tended to lessen the power of the feudal nobles. The continual aim of the French monarchs during the feudal period was to establish *villes bourgeoises* in the royal domain and to encourage the erection of Communes in the territories of their vassals. In time the changes of circumstances convinced the Communes that an abrogation of their charters and submission either to the king or to some powerful lord would give to them more security from external aggression and more persistent internal tranquillity. In the reign of Philip the Fair (1285-1314) the counter-communal revolution had progressed so far that it was then generally admitted that no Commune could be established without the royal consent, and from that time the number of the *villes bourgeoises* increased, forming that power which was destined to be known in time as the Third Estate.

In Italy the Communes flourished more than in any other country. Unlike France, England and Germany, there were then in the north of Italy no powerful dukes and counts who were so many petty kings; the royal authority, united with the imperial, was at a

[7] "Lettres sur l'Histoire de France," Vol. XXV., Paris, 1827.

distance, and it was generally disputed by some of its own immediate German subjects, and the Italian cities naturally profited by the fact. The Communes of Lombardy soon became veritable republics. In Germany, unless along the Rhine and in the far interior, free cities were unknown long after they had attained to a flourishing condition in other lands. In England the free municipalities generally allied themselves with the aristocracy in order to curb the power of the monarch. In Spain the *fueros* corresponded to the communal charters in France, but they limited the royal authority as it was circumscribed in no other land, the king enjoying only the right of appointing a *corregidor* or municipal chief, who was to be confirmed by the *junta*, a legislative body which was elected by an almost universal suffrage. In 1058 Alfonso V., king of Spain, gave its first *fueros* to the kingdom of Leon, after deliberation with the episcopal body; but the first *fueros* of Castile had originated in 1012. The dawn of the sixteenth century witnessed the disappearance of these privileges, save in name, unless in Aragon, which continued to boast of the royal power of its Cortes until Philip II. abolished it with the armed hand. Unlike the Spanish monarch, the French hero of the crime of Anagni, that Philip the Fair the memory of whose outrage on Pope Boniface VIII. has been perpetuated by the immortal Dante,[8] used no armed force in order to destroy the Communes of France. With that spirit which animated Napoleon III. when he granted a "universal suffrage" which he expected to dominate, Philip the Fair thought that the States General would effect his object, since its composition showed less of independence than that of the Communes. The States General, remarks Augustin Thierry, "derived its force and its spirit from two different sources: from the commercial classes and from the officers of justice and finance, who were generally of plebeian origin. The *bourgeois* of the cities clung to their local franchises, to their hereditary rights and to the independent and privileged existence of their municipalities. On the contrary, the spirit of the legists admitted but one right, that of the State (as is the wont of most modern dabblers in statecraft); they acknowledged but one liberty, that of the ruler, and their logic was no more favorable to the plebeian than it was to the noble." It is to be observed that the legists here stigmatized by Thierry were generally mere creatures and flatterers of the king; as the historian says: "these were

[8] Entering Alagna, lo! the fleur-de-lis,
And in His vicar, Christ a captive led!
I see Him mocked a second time—again
The vinegar and gall produced I see;
And Christ Himself 'twixt living robbers slain.
Wright's translation.

the men who prepared the way for the revolutionists of the future, when they proclaimed the absolute power of one man."[9] And even Michelet does not hesitate to aver: "They were the tyrants of France. With a horrible calmness they undertook a servile imitation of the Roman law and of the Roman imperial extortions. These cruel demolishers of the Middle Age were the founders of the civil order of modern times; secular jurisprudence is generally a foe of the ecclesiastical."[10]

REUBEN PARSONS.

Yonkers, N. Y.

THE TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AND OF THE CHURCH REGARDING DIVORCE.

II.

SO FAR we have only touched upon the Gospel teaching regarding divorce; if we now turn to the Apostle we find that a system of moral teaching has already arisen upon the question of Christian marriage. As is well known, St. Paul's converts at Corinth wrote to ask him various liturgical and doctrinal questions, one of which regarded the marriage. In the seventh chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians the Apostle gives them a complete treatise upon the states of wedlock and virginity. In the space of one chapter comprising only forty verses he lays down on these two points principles which have served ever since as the guiding star of the Church and her theologians.

After laying down that the celibate life is good, St. Paul recalls the words of our Lord which we have examined above and concludes from them, as we saw from St. Augustine, that if Christian married people do separate, they may not marry again during one another's lifetime. As he had said when writing to the Romans:

> For the woman that hath a husband, whilst her husband liveth is bound to the law. But if her husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.
>
> Therefore, whilst her husband liveth, she shall be called an adulteress, if she be with another man; but if her husband be dead, she is delivered from the law of her husband: so that she is not an adulteress if she be with another man.—Rom. vii., 2-3.

Only her husband's death releaseth her from the bond. He then proceeds to speak upon his own Apostolic authority, for he has no express words of the Lord, when on earth, to fall back upon:

---

[9] *Loc. cit.*, xxv., p. 277.

[10] "Histoire de France," Vol. III., p. 39, Paris, 1830.

For to the rest I speak, not the Lord. If any brother have a wife that believeth not, and she consent to dwell with him, let him not put her away.
And if any woman have a husband that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her, let her not put away her husband.
For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband: otherwise your children should be unclean; but now they are holy.
But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases. But God hath called us in peace.
For how knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? Or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?

The case here proposed by St. Paul is known as the "casus Apostoli" and affords room for much discussion. It is evident that the Corinthians in their letter had put before him a difficulty which must have been of very frequent occurrence in the early days of the Church, namely, that arising from husband or wife becoming a Christian while the partner remains an infidel. The whole case furnishes us with a vivid commentary on our Blessed Lord's own words:

Think ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you no, but separation.
For there shall be from henceforth five in one house divided; three against two, and two against three.
The father against the son, and the son against his father, the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother, the mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.—S. Luke xii., 51-53.

Up to a certain point St. Paul is exceedingly clear in his discussion of this delicate question. He first insists that the adoption of the new religion does not mean a relaxation of all former ties and that the Christian husband or wife are by no means at liberty to leave their heathen partner. He gives as his reason that

For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband: otherwise your children should be unclean; but now they are holy.

The true Christian will by a holy life sanctify a union which might otherwise seem like defilement. Man and wife are one, therefore if one be sanctified, so also will be the union of the two, and this, argues the Apostle, is clear from the fact that your children are not considered defiled because father or mother is a heathen, but rather because one of the parents is sanctified, so also the offspring; much more, then, will the union between husband and wife be sanctified, since it is of a far more intimate nature than that between parents and children.

St. Paul now passes to the exception to this rule of permanence in the wedded state:

But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases. But God hath called us in peace.

The unbelieving husband or wife may refuse to live any longer with the Christian wife or husband. If that be the case, says the

Apostle, let him or her depart; in other words, do not feel bound to insist upon his or her remaining. "For God hath called us in peace," and such compulsory union when tastes have now become so diametrically opposed certainly would not make for peace.

The really difficult point is to understand what St. Paul understood by not being "under servitude in such cases." If we put aside all teaching of the Church upon the point for the moment we shall feel obliged to say that the Apostle has here laid down merely a general principle to guide those of his converts whose adoption of the Catholic religion had strained their previously existing relations with others, whether husband and wife, father or son, mother or daughter. The embitterment consequent upon conversion might be intense and life might become unbearable, and yet a stern sense of duty might prompt the sufferer, if in the superior position, to refuse to waive his previous rights and duties; a husband might feel it wrong to permit his wife to leave him because she found his new religion insufferable; fathers might feel it a neglect of paternal duty to suffer their children to leave them; and yet not merely severe mental suffering, but even inability to practise their religion in peace might result: "the brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases," answers the Apostle, "but God hath called us in peace."

But can we go further and say that the words here mean the dissolution of the marriage bond, so that each party is free to marry again? This is the teaching of the Church which, relying upon this passage, declares that in the case of one of two unbaptized married persons becoming a Christian, the unwillingness of the unconverted party to live peaceably with the other dissolves the bond of matrimony.

Yet it is clear that just as a father does not dissolve the tie existing between himself and his son because he suffers him to depart, so neither is the bond between husband and wife—a bond stronger than that between father and son—dissolved by the determination of one to separate. St. Paul's words, then, do not on the surface signify the solution of the marriage bond, and if it were not for the habitual practice of the Church whose teaching is founded on this text, we should not be compelled to see in them a permission to re-marry.

Cardinal Cajetan, in his commentary on the Epistle, says: "For a brother or a sister is not called to servitude in such cases," that is, a brother or sister, a Christian husband or wife, is not called in such an event to be subject to the servitude of wedlock, so the Church commonly understands St. Paul's words; for she gathers from them that if the unbeliever depart, the Christian husband or

wife is free to contract another marriage. But I must add that St. Paul does not clearly declare such a liberty; he only denies that they are subject to servitude in such cases. Now, if we carefully examine these words, they only mean that in such departures or separations between the unbeliever and the believer, be it unbelieving husband from believing wife, unbelieving son from Christian father, unbelieving father from Christian son, and so on, no brother or sister, that is, no Christian man or woman, is bound to their former servitude, such as that, for instance, by which son is bound to father and father to son, daughter to mother and mother to daughter, wife to husband and husband to wife. But that does not prove that the marriage bond is annulled any more than the paternal or filial bond is annulled. And if you limit the question to matrimony, the literal sense of the words is clearly that when one so departs, a brother or sister, *i. e.*, the Christian wife or husband is not bound to the slavery of living with the heathen husband or wife (non est servitudi morem gerendi conjugi subjectus); but this is clearly not a dissolution of the marriage bond. And I am stupefied with amazement that when Christ so clearly made an exception of the case of fornication (referring to his comment on St. Matthew which we gave above), the whole stream of theologians refuses to allow that the husband has any such liberty, but when, on the contrary, Paul speaks anything but clearly, his words are interpreted as signifying a dissolution of the bond of matrimony, and that, too, for a different cause from the only one which Christ allowed."

All must allow the cogency of Cajetan's reasoning, and the more we examine the text the less easy it seems to deny his conclusion. In fact, most of the commentaries seem to us little else than cases of special pleading, and we cannot help wondering what their conclusion would have been had they not been necessarily biased by the teaching of the Church and by a very natural wish to make that teaching fit in with the prima facie view of the text.

We must never forget that St. Paul's seventh chapter in his First Epistle to the Corinthians is a complete treatise on matrimony, and if we attempt an analysis of it we shall realize how packed the argument is and how pregnant every word. He proceeds from point to point with marked precision, and though while avoiding minute and captious casuistry, he yet maps out the great principles which are to govern the Christian in the various cases which may arise.

I. To the unmarried.

It is good to remain unmarried:

But I say to the unmarried, and to the widows: it is good for them if they so continue, even as I.

But if they do not contain themselves, let them marry. For it is better to marry than to be burnt.

II. To the married Christians.

(*a*) They are not to separate.

(*b*) If they do separate, they are not to marry during the lifetime of one another:

But to them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband.
And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife.

III. The case with which we are concerned, that namely of two who were married when as yet neither were believers. What is to happen if one of them be converted?

(*a*) If the unconverted party will agree to live in peace with the Christian, the latter should not insist on a separation:

For to the rest I speak, not the Lord. If any brother have a wife that believeth not, and she consent to dwell with him, let him not put her away.
And if any woman have a husband that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her, let her not put away her husband.
For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband: otherwise your children should be unclean; but now they are holy.

(*b*) But if the unbelieving husband or wife will not live peaceably with the Christian, but insists on a separation, let him have it.

But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases. But God hath called us in peace.
For how knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? Or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?

Where note that the same word "depart" is used as in verse 10 above, where he is talking of the married Christians.

That the Church does, as Cajetan allowed, so understand these words of St. Paul is clear.

Thus St. Ambrose, in his commentary on the words, "but if the believer depart, let him depart," writes:

"He safeguards the intention (propositum) of religion by bidding Christians not to dissolve their marriages; but if the unbeliever depart through hatred of God, the believer will not be guilty of the dissolution of the marriage, for the cause of God is higher than that of matrimony. 'For a brother or a sister is not bound to servitude in such cases.' For he who abhors the Author of marriage cannot expect that reverence should be paid to his marriage. That marriage is not 'ratified' (ratum) which is contracted without any respect (devotio) to God, and consequently it is no sin for the one who is put away out of hatred to God to contract a second marriage. But the unbeliever who thus departs is clearly sinning both against God and against his marriage, and so there is no obligation to keep the troth plighted to him in marriage, since he departed

precisely so as not to learn that the God of the Christians was the Author of marriage."

St. Chrysostom, however, is not quite so clear, and we should rather be inclined to think that in the following passage he does not contemplate the dissolution of the bond. In his commentary on the words, "But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart," he says: "What is the meaning of 'if the unbeliever depart?'" and he answers: "For instance, if he bid thee sacrifice and take part in his ungodliness on account of thy marriage, or part company, it were better the marriage were annulled (divellatur) and no breach made in godliness. Wherefore he adds 'for a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases.' If day by day he buffet thee and keep up combats on this account, it is better to separate. For this is what he glances at, saying, 'but God hath called us in peace.' And when it comes to that, it is the other party who hath furnished the ground for separation, even as he did who committed fornication." (Hom. on I. Cor. vii., Oxford Transl., vol. i., p. 251.)

St. Augustine's evidence as to the teaching which the Church founded on these words of St. Paul is most interesting. Recalling what we said above about his treatise "de conjugiis adulterinis," we should naturally expect to find here a full examination of the "Casus Apostoli" if the saint had ever heard of it. Now, as we have seen, the saint refuted his friend Polilianus, who had drawn a false conclusion from the Apostle's words about Christian married people, by a minute examination of our Lord's own doctrine about marriage.

The saint then proceeds to examine the Apostle's words:

> For to the rest I speak, not the Lord. If any brother have a wife that believeth not, and she consent to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And if any woman have a husband that believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her, let her not put away her husband.—I. Cor. vii., 12-13.

He gathers from this that the Christian is *free* to put away his unbelieving partner, though the Apostle *counsels* men not to do so; "and indeed," adds St. Augustine, "if a man is allowed to be separated from his wife because of bodily fornication, how much more should he (be free to) shew his detestation of that fornication which pertains to the mind? . . . . but because it is lawful, it is not therefore expedient, lest by reason of such separations men should be offended and should grow to have a horror of that the very doctrine of salvation which prohibits what is illicit, and should perhaps grow worse and worse and cling to their unbelief."

Note, not a word about the convert being free to marry again, even the separation is discountenanced, though allowed to be just; it is discountenanced because of the scandals which might thence

arise, how much would the saint if he had ever thought of such a thing discountenanced the idea of the Christian who had thus separated from the unbelieving partner marrying again during the latter's lifetime? Are we not shut up to the conclusion that such an idea was unknown to him and that consequently it was not the practice at least of the African Church in his day? The same must be said about his treatise "De Sermone Domini in monte," and in the "De Fide et Operibus," where he speaks of matrimony and divorce.

It is clear, then, that the Church's teaching, which is now known as the "Casus Apostoli," was, as was indeed to be expected, of only practical growth. As Cajetan insists, the text of St. Paul is by no means clear and that a conclusion which, to say the least of it, is not clear upon the surface should be uniformly drawn from it during all ages of the Church was not to be expected.

The uncertainty for a long time prevalent on this point is clearly seen in the Decree of Innocent III., "De divortiis:" "Your fraternity has intimated to us that one of two married people has lapsed into heresy and that he wishes to marry again, and you write to us to ask whether this can be done. We reply, then, to your letter by making a distinction, *though one of our predecessors seems to have thought otherwise*, between the case where one of two unbelievers (who are married) is converted to the Catholic faith, and the case where one of two believers lapses into hersey or becomes a pagan."

Thus in the Corpus Juris Canonici, Lib. ii., titulus xvi., "Sed etsi" (Lancellotti):

"But if the marriage was celebrated between infidels and was consummated, if one of them remains an unbeliever and wishes to depart from the believer, or at least will not dwell with him or her, without insulting their Creator, it is lawful for the Christian not only to dissolve the marriage, but also to marry another. And in such cases the marriage is annulled by the authority of the Apostolic See and of the Roman Pontiff; the bond of wedlock is dissolved not by human power, but by Divine."

That it was no unusual thing, however, for catechumens to leave their wives is evident from the legislation of the above quoted Council of Granada in the year 305 on the subject. Thus Canon X. reads: "If she who has been dismissed by a Catechumen should marry, she can be admitted to baptism." This evidently contemplates the possibility of the heathen wife of a catechumen being put away by the latter in accordance with the "Casus Apostoli" and afterwards herself becoming a Christian; having moreover married in the meanwhile, the Council would seem to decide that

she has not really two husbands, as might appear at first sight, and can in consequence be lawfully admitted to baptism.

Those who maintain that St. Paul does really contemplate here a dissolution of the very bond of matrimony must be prepared to face the fact that St. Paul, with our Lord's words in his mind regarding the indissolubility of marriage, and referring, too, at least by implication, to the only cause for separation which the Lord had allowed, yet here grants a dispensation which Christ never seems to have contemplated.

We may well ask them, putting the question to them in this way: If our Blessed Lord laid down so positively that a man could put away his wife only when unfaithful, and if, further, He at least implied that not even this really dissolved the bond of matrimony existing between them, but only allowed of a separation so that neither party could marry again in the lifetime of the other, if the Author of marriage did this, how can we interpret St. Paul as allowing another cause to be sufficient to dissolve the bond of marriage?

The answer seems to be, as we have said above, that St. Paul's words say nothing of the kind. If his words in verse 15 mean that the unwillingness of the unconverted husband or wife be a sufficient cause for dissolving the bond of matrimony, how can the Apostle, in verse 39 of the very same chapter, write: "A woman is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband die, she is at liberty, let her marry whom she will?" As a matter of fact, the Apostle is not treating of the Sacrament of Matrimony precisely as such, but rather of the change which adoption of the new religion may necessitate in the relations between husband and wife; and on this point he says in plain terms that it is better to have a separation than to feel bound to attempt to live in harmony with one who has made up his or her mind not to live in harmony. What the Lord had refused to sacramental marriage the Apostle felt obliged to concede to heathen marriage. Those who had received the sacrament of matrimony were not to separate except, according to the more usual interpretation of St. Matthew xix., 9, because of the adultery of one of the parties, and even then they were neither of them to marrry again during one another's lifetime. Those, however, who had only contracted natural marriages the Apostle allows to separate even when no such crime has been committed, and he appends as his reason:

> For how knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? Or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?

The Church, however, has gone a step further, and looking precisely at matrimony from the point of view of a sacrament, and

realizing, moreover, that such unions between heathens have no sacramental character—a point with which the Apostle was not concerned—she uses as a starting point the Apostle's declaration that such parties can separate, and declares that not only is a separation allowable in such cases, but that the very bond of matrimony is dissolved.

A clear view of the Church's position with regard to the Sacrament of Matrimony will help us to understand this teaching. Matrimony is a natural contract which by its very nature is indissoluble, not indeed that its dissolution is contrary to the law of nature, taken in the rigorous sense of the word, but that it is prohibited as being one of those things which are less in accord with nature. This contract, moreover, was raised by Christ to the dignity of a sacrament, and is indissoluble by a Divine precept superadded to the law of nature: "What God hath joined together let no *man* put asunder." What, however, *God* hath joined together He Himself, or His vicegerent, can put asunder. That the Church can declare that the merely natural contract of infidel matrimony is rendered void by the conversion of one of the parties and the unwillingness of the other to live in harmony with the Christian party, the reason being that the enforcement of the yoke in such cases is opposed to the very object for which a man has embraced the Christian religion, "for God hath called us in peace." Such marriages are by the very nature of the contract indissoluble, but no Divine seal has been put upon them, for heathens can receive no sacrament. A true sacramental marriage the Church cannot dissolve, for God's seal is already upon it, and He does not undo His own work.

The marriages of heathens are, says St. Thomas, true marriages, but since they look only to the material perfecting of their children, they are not so perfect as Christian marriages, the end of which is the spiritual as well as material perfecting of their offspring.

Again, the Church cannot change the nature of the marriage contract, but she can decide that certain things will prevent the contract being a true one and thus susceptive of the seal of the sacrament. She can, for instance, decide that those already under the contract of solemn vows cannot validly enter into the matrimonial contract; and similarly that a heathen and a Christian cannot make the true matrimonial contract between themselves.

When, then, the Church declares that such heathen marriages are dissolved by the unwillingness of the heathen husband or wife to live peaceably with the converted wife or husband, we must acknowledge the justice of her decision, for it is not now "man" who "puts asunder," but God. When, however, the Church rests this teaching on the words of St. Paul in this chapter, we are not bound

to say that his words explicitly and in their primary import signify such a doctrine, though we cannot question the Church's right to deduce such a conclusion by implication from his words.

The Church has in at least one instance solemnly defined the actual meaning of certain words of Holy Scripture. Thus the Council of Trent, sess. xxii., can. i.: "The Holy, Œcumenical and General Synod of Trent teaches, declares and decrees that the following be preached to the faithful: 'Our Lord and God. . . . at the Last Supper . . . offered up to God His Father His own Body and Blood under the appearance of bread and wine and gave them under the same symbols to His Apostles to receive, and at the same time He appointed them to be the priests of the New Testament; and He commanded them and their successors in the priesthood to offer these same symbols when He said "Do this in memory of Me," as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught.'"

Here is a solemn definition as to the exact significance of the words, "Do this in memory of Me;" but it is far otherwise with the words of the Apostle "But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases."

Pope Innocent III., in libro 4, Decr. tit. 19, cap. vii., "De divortiis," writes as follows:

"If one of two married heathens be converted to the Catholic faith, and the other be in no way willing to dwell with him (or her), or at least not without blaspheming the Divine name or attempting to lead him (or her) into mortal sin, the other (*i. e.*, the one who has become a Christian) can marry again if he wish, and in this sense we understand what the Apostle says: 'If the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases.' And so we also understand the canon which enacts that 'contumely towards the Creator dissolves the right (jus) of matrimony for the other party.'"

And this is the doctrine of Peter Lombard and of his disciple St. Thomas. St. Thomas asks if a man who has become a Christian can put away his wife who remains a heathen, even if she be willing to live peaceably with him. He answers in the affirmative, but inconsiderately asks whether the convert can then marry another during the lifetime of his heathen wife. The convert, he answers, is free to leave her, but if she herself is willing to live with him and will not try to lead him back to his heathen state, he cannot, though he put her away, marry another. If, however, she will not live peaceably with him, he can not only put her away, but can marry another.

We cannot better conclude this investigation into the teaching

of the New Testament and the practice of the Church regarding divorce than by giving the words of the catechism of the Council of Trent:

"By the testimony of Christ the Lord it is easily proved that the bond of marriage cannot be dissolved by divorce; for if after a bill of divorce the wife were freed from the law of her husband, she might, without the guilt of adultery, wed another husband; yet our Lord expressly declares that 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.' (St. Luke xvi., 18.) Wherefore it is clear that the bond of marriage can be dissolved by death alone; and this the Apostle also confirms when he says: 'A woman is bound by the law, so long as her husband liveth; but if her husband die, she is at liberty: let her marry whom she will, only in the Lord' (I. Cor. vii., 39); and again: 'To them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth that the wife depart not from her husband; and if she depart, that she remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband' (I. Cor. vii., 10). To the woman who might have left her husband for a just cause the Apostle offers that option either to remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband; for Holy Church does not permit one to separate from the other without rather weighty reasons.'" (Part ii., chap. viii., question xx.)

H. Pope, O. P.

Rugely, England.

RICHARD CRASHAW.

STRANGELY enough, it is not the greatest man of our acquaintance with whom we form the closest friendship nor for whom we entertain the sincerest admiration. The lowly life of quiet service known only to a limited circle has a power of personal influence which can never be shared by those natures which are extensive rather than intensive, and the same holds good of the authors who become more than friends to those of us who live the mental life. A poet whom we feel to be our particular friend will seldom be one of the first and greatest among the children of the muses, but one whose song gushed from his heart as spontaneously as the lay of the wild bird of the forest and found an echo in our own souls. Such a poet was Richard Crashaw. His song was of the "inmost utmost things of faith" and has only to be known to be loved. The body of English devotional poetry is so

small and its quality mediocre that we can well afford to recall the memory of a Catholic poet who is to-day unfortunately almost unknown except to literary scholars.

Richard Crashaw was born, according to the university register, in London in the year 1612. He was the only son of William Crashaw, B. D., a famous Puritan preacher who for a long time occupied the pulpit of the historic Temple. The name of the mother is unknown. The child was baptized by Ussher (afterward Archbishop of Dublin) and received his early education at Charterhouse. He entered Cambridge University as a gentleman pensioner of Pembroke Hall in 1631. As a student he became proficient in Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Italian and Spanish. It may also help us to understand the man to know that he was a good musician and very clever with his pencil and brush, one of the editions of his poems (that of 1652) being illustrated by his own drawings.

Of his undergraduate life we know but one incident, the death of a certain William Herries, with whom Crashaw had been intimate and in whose memory he wrote several rather conventional elegies. He received his B. A. in 1634. On November 26, 1636, he was transferred to St. Peter's College—commonly called Peterhouse—and elected a fellow of that college the following year. In 1638 he proceeded to his M. A.

Some time during his residence as a graduate at Cambridge he was incorporated at Oxford, but whether as a bachelor or master does not appear. The fact, however, is testimony to his scholarship and throws some light on his academic standing and may account in some degree for his apparently large place in the councils of the greatest ecclesiastic which England had produced since S. Thomas à Becket. At this time there was going on in England a revival of Catholic life and practice which in many ways may fairly be compared to the great Oxford movement, which was inaugurated in the common room of Oriel College in 1837, and for a time it seemed as if there were to be a reconciliation between England and the Holy See; but the rise of the Puritans to power ended these fair hopes, and Archbishop Laud went to the block, whither the King himself was to follow. There were, however, differences between the two movements mentioned above: the nineteenth century movement took hold at once of the scholar in the university halls and the population of the slums, while the Laudian revival seems to have been almost entirely scholastic in its impulse and limited in its influence to the higher classes. Into this movement Crashaw flung himself with an abandon and enthusiasm which, whether we sympathize with him or no, is nevertheless

very refreshing. He spent long vigils in the splendid chapel of Peterhouse, where saints and angels carved in stone adorned the altar piece, above which was a glorious window of fifteenth century glass, which fortunately had been judiciously hidden in the disorderly days of the boy King Edward VI. He reread the writings of the Church Fathers and studied the rich religious literature which was at this time being produced in Spain. Another factor in his psychological development at this period was Nicholas Farrar, who, after a busy and useful life as secretary of the Virginia Company, had revived the religious life at Little Geddings, where his brother, his nieces, his nephews and a few other persons to the number of thirty or more lived according to rule, saying the old Sarum hours and printing and binding exquisite little books. Crashaw often visited here, coming from the university with a few devout students to make communion after an all night vigil in the little chapel where world-sick souls watched and prayed for a morning which they were never to see. Here Crashaw and Farrar, who was a Spanish scholar of considerable attainment, discussed together "The Flaming Heart" of St. Teresa and the works of the other Spanish mystics. No doubt they talked like Faber and Pusey at a later day of

> . . . . how scantily
> In what thrifty rivulets
> Faith's weak tide among us sets.

But these were unsettled times. England was on the verge of civil war. Just before Christmas, 1643, the Parliamentary Commission sacked the Cambridge colleges and gave the fellows the choice of the covenant, as they called it, or expulsion—a good share of them were men enough to take the latter. The destruction of works of art, statuary, plate and priceless old stained glass reported by the ignorant iconoclasts is enough to make one angry after over two hundred and fifty years. The fact that some of these statues were "mighty angels with wings all of solid gold" may account for the activity of the Puritans: the sale must have netted a pretty sum, for you may be sure the gold was not spurned by these pious soldiers.

Crashaw was fortunately at Oxford keeping term and so was not expelled, as has been sometimes stated. Needless to say, it was a great shock to him. On every side he saw the triumph of what he can have regarded only as the powers of darkness, and national apostasy was well nigh a fact. He must have made his peace with the Roman See some time in 1646—probably in France. There is no record of the submission, and it may not have been formal as we understand the term to-day. He lived for two years

in Paris. He was very poor and would probably have known actual want if it had not have been for the poet Cowley, who discovered him and introduced him to the English Queen Marie Henrietta, who was an exile in France. She gave him letters to Cardinal Palotta in Rome. Thither Crashaw went about a year later, and in 1648 became secretary to this Cardinal. Like many another English Catholic at the Papal court, the sensitive Crashaw was shocked by the vulgar immorality of the inferior ecclesiastics around him, and at length spoke his mind to the Cardinal. The history of this incident is not as complete as we could wish, but it evidently ended in the Cardinal's decision that Crashaw would be better off and perhaps safer elsewhere, so he got him appointed Guardian of the Holy House at Loretto. This was April 24, 1649. The four months of life which remained to Crashaw were a beautiful and fitting conclusion to a career which had been eminently pious and even saintly. Gosse has drawn a picture which emphasizes perhaps too much temporal and spatial elements of our poet's experiences at this time, but under the veil of earthly things such a soul could hardly fail to grasp the eternal realities.

We can imagine with what feelings of rapture the world-worn poet crossed the Appennines and descended to the dry little town above the Adriatic, in which no doubt he pictured to himself a haunt of peace and prayer until his life's end. As he ascended the hill he saw before him the magnificent basilica which Bramante had built as a shelter for the Holy House, and he would feel that his feet were indeed entering upon the shelter of his rest. With what joy, with what beating heart he would long to see the very Santa Casa, the cottage built of bricks which angels lifted from Nazareth out of the black hands of the Saracens and gently dropped among the nightingales in the forest of Loretto on that mystic night in the year 1294! Here indeed a delicious life seemed planned for Crashaw—to minister all day in the rich incense; to touch the very raiment of Our Lady, stiff with pearls and rubies to the feet; to trim the golden lamps, the offerings of [illegible] the whole Catholic world; to pass in and out between the golden cherubim and the brazen seraphim; to cleanse the mosaics of lapis-lazuli and to polish the silver bas-reliefs till they shouted the story of the magic flight from Nazareth. There in the very house of Jesus to hear the noise and mutter of the officiating priests, the bustle of canons, chaplains, monks and deacons, the shrill, sweet voices of the acolytes singing all day long—this must have seemed the very end of life and the beginning of heaven to the mystical and sensuous Crashaw. He died August 25, 1649, probably of a fever, although Bargrave darkly hints at poison administered by some of the followers of Cardinal Palotta.

His only memorial is a portrait in stained glass in the chapel of Peterhouse, Cambridge, where he is represented as holding his poems in one hand and a pallet and brushes in the other. His poems seem to have enjoyed some considerable popularity in the seventeenth century, there being four editions, 1646, 1648, 1652 (Paris, with his own illustrations) and 1670. Selections were published in 1775, and in the nineteenth century there were two reprints, 1856 and 1872, the latter being by Grossart and gracefully dedicated to Cardinal Newman. A volume of selections, if published at a reasonable price, would be a valuable addition to our somewhat limited number of devotional poets, and it is to be hoped that some at least of the poems may be rendered accessible to the ordinary reading public within the next few years. It is with this end in view that I shall venture to give frequent quotations.

Crashaw must be studied under his two characters of translator and original poet. It has been said that a poet's translations are the final test of his mastery over technique, and yet there are some poets—of which Longfellow is a particular example—who seem to write better verse under the trammels incident to translation. "The Office of the Holy Cross" is a poetical translation of the hours of the Holy Cross which figure so prominently in early English devotional books such as the primers and manuals. The Recommendation which is printed immediately after the Office reflects the deep piety of our poet:

> These Hours, and that which hovers o'er my end
> Into Thy hands and heart, Lord, I commend.
>
> Take both to Thine account, that I and mine
> In that hour and in these may be all Thine;
>
> That as I dedicate my devoutest breath
> To make a kind of life for my Lord's death,
>
> So from His living and life-giving death,
> My life may draw a new and never fleeting breath.

Vexilla Regis is, I believe, the first really literary English translation of that grand old hymn familiar to students of hymnology in the translation beginning The Royal Banner forward goes. The second and third stanzas are as follows:

> Lo! how the streams of life from that full nest
> Of loves, Thy Lord's too liberal breast,
> Flow in an amorous flood
> Of water wedding blood.
> With these he washed thy stain, transferred the smart
> And took it home to His own heart.
> . . . . . .
> Large throne of Love! royally spread
> With purple of too rich a red:
> Thy crime is too much duty;
> Thy burden too much beauty;
> Glorious or grievous more? thus to make good
> Thy costly excellence with thy King's own blood.

It departs considerably from the Latin text and is perhaps the weakest of all the translations except the twenty-third Psalm, which frankly calls itself a paraphrase.

Sancta Maria Dolorum is based on the Stabat Mater Dolorosa, but shows traces of the influence of the other Stabat—the Stabat Mater Speciosa; but there is far more of Crashaw in this poem than of the old unknown Latin poet, and it was not until I had grasped our author's literary theory of translation that excluded it from the number of the original poems and placed it here, although it often wanders far beyond the limits allowed to translation in our own day. As is usual in Marian verse, the vocabulary and imagery are drawn almost entirely from the Song of Solomon and the prophetic books of the Old Testament. Apparently there has been no influence exerted by the Little Office (Farrar only revived the canonical hours of Sarum), but there are two passages which may have found their inspiration in the Litany of Loretto and the opening lines of the last stanza:

> Let me suck the wine,
> So long of that chaste vine,
> Till drunk of the dear wounds, I be
> A lost thing to this world as it to me,

is probably an echo of St. Ignatius Loyola's "Blood of Christ, inebriate me!"

The translations of the two Psalms are at the two extremes of merit. That of the twenty-third is no great credit to Crashaw, but the virility and passion of the one hundred and thirty-seventh makes it one of the best, if not *the* best, metrical translation of a psalm in our language:

> On the proud banks of great Euphrates' flood,
> There we sat and there we wept;
> Our harps which now no music understood,
> Nodding on the willows slept;
> While unhappy captived we,
> Lovely Sion, thought on thee.
> They, they that snatched us from our countries' breast
> Would have a song carved to their ears
> In Hebrew numbers, then (O cruel jest!)
> When harps and hearts were drowned in tears:
> Come, they cried, come sing and play
> One of Sion's songs to-day.
> Sing? Play? To whom (ah!) shall we sing or play,
> If not, Jerusalem, to thee?
> Ah! thee, Jerusalem! ah! sooner may
> This hand forget the mastery
> Of music's dainty touch, than I
> The music of thy memory.
> Which when I lose, O may at once my tongue
> Lose this same busy speaking art,
> Unpearch't, her vocal arteries unstrung,
> No more acquainted with my heart,
> On my dry pallet's roof to rest
> A withered leaf, an idle guest.
> No, no. Thy good Sion, alone, must crown
> The head of all my hope-nursed joys.
> But Edom, cruel thou! thou criest down, down,

Sing, Sion, down and never rise,
Her falling thou did'st urge and thrust
And haste to dash her in the dust.
Dost laugh? Proud Babel's daughter! do, laugh on,
Till thy ruin teach the tears,
Even such as these; laugh till a venging throng
Of woes, too late, do rouse thy fears.
Laugh till thy children's bleeding bones
Weep precious tears upon the stones.

These "Hebrew numbers" is perhaps a trace of Crashaw's Greek scholarship, and certainly is not without its value. The passionate longing of the exile had been his, and the translation therefore becomes more than a mere academic exercise and rises into the realm of creative verse and gives a new force to the psalm itself.

The translation "Ecce Panis Angelorum," unlike the others which we have considered so far, keeps very closely to the Latin text and has some very strong lines, as:

Nor touch nor taste must ask for more,
But each sit still in his own door.

Oh, dear memorial of that death
Which lives still and allows us breath.
When Glories sun Faith's shades shall chase
And for thy veil give us thy Face.

"Oh, soft, self-wounding pelican" is an instance of the "unnatural natural history" so common in mystical authors and which played so large a part in Euphuism.

Lauda Sion Salvatorum, the sequence for Corpus Christi, is also wonderfully strong, but the first, fourth and sixth stanzas tell their own story more eloquently than a critic can hope to do:

1. Rise, royal Sion! rise and sing
Thy soul's kind shepherd, thy heart's king.
Stretch all thy powers; call if you can
Harps of heaven to hands of man.
This sovereign subject sits above
The best ambition of thy love.

4. Lo, the new law of a new Lord,
With a new lamb blesses the board:
The aged Pascha pleads not years,
But spies Love's dawn and disappears.
Types yield to truths; shades shrink away;
And their Night dies into our Day.

6. The Heaven-instructed house of Faith,
Here a holy dictate hath,
That they but lend their form and face;
Themselves with reverence leave their place,
Nature and name to be made good
By a nobler bread, more needful blood.

It may fairly be doubted whether in all the range of poetry there is a stanza more pregnant with eucharistic teaching than this last, and certainly its first line gives us a beautiful and suggestive name for the Church.

The translation of "Dies Irae Dies Illa" is wonderfully severe,

solemn and intense, but at times we get something which is far nearer to being Crashaw's reaction to a stanza than a mere translation, as:

> Dear, remember in that day
> Who was the cause thou cam'st this way.
> Thy sheep was strayed, and thou would'st be
> Even lost Thyself in seeking me.

Once read receptively and the words haunt with an awful persistency. The melody is the music of a master and the occasional discords only enhance the majesty of the verse; but unfortunately the four-line stanza precludes all possibility of singing it to the traditional music.

The secular translations are some of them very delicate and musical, but they are neither better nor worse than a vast quantity of similar work and need not detain us here.

Before turning to the original poems we must take account of the two most striking characteristics of Crashaw's literary style: his mysticism and his use of the conceit. The roots of both lie, as we shall see, deep down in the very constitution of his mind, and in the final analysis have the same origin.

Of late years it has become the fashion to regard all mystics as either mildly insane or incipiently imbecile; but while either of these statements may be occasionally true, neither can be accepted as a necessary concomitant of mysticism. On the contrary, a perfectly sane and vigorous mind may be decidedly mystical, provided that the emotional nature is highly developed and the associative processes active. The fact that all language descriptive of the emotional experience is necessarily figurative accounts for the symbolic literary form in which religious and philosophical thought invariably clothes itself, unless it is consciously scientific and technical, partially accounts for this. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the river of life or the gruesome fountain filled with blood of a popular Protestant hymn are simply visualized literary expressions for ideas which an unemotional nature is able to connect only by the greatest effort; but in the delirium of emotion such figures are spontaneously produced by imaginative minds, which very naturally soon acquire the habit of employing the symbol for the more complex and less picturesque if more scientific formula.

Altogether too much stress has been laid on Crashaw's conversion in this connection, for the language of mysticism is pretty much the same whether it is Roman or Anglican, whether Christian or Hindoo. There is always the same tendency to visualize or otherwise reduce to terms of sense perception abstract philosophical ideas and personal emotions, yet if one of these mystics were suddenly interrupted in the midst of the wildest of mystical flights, and

when his language had become well nigh a lingo he would probably be able with some help to reduce his ideas to a form of expression which could be fairly considered normal, if not actually commonplace. For instance, a theologian may discourse in highly mystical language of Jonah and the whale, making Jonah a type of Christ and the whale a type of the tomb in which our Lord lay for three days, as did Jonah in the belly of the whale, and Nineveth a type of the world—the subject is a favorite one with mystical theologians. Yet twenty minutes later the same theologian may be talking in the most measured and learned terms concerning the textual and critical questions involved in the study of the Book of Jonah in a way which the ordinary mind finds it difficult to square with his former mystical utterances. The fact is that the life of devotion is not the life of the mind, nor is it exclusive of it, and the story of Jonah furnishes analogies which are useful for religious purposes when it is desirable to appeal to the emotions rather than to the intellect.

Crashaw's mysticism is, however, the mysticism of the pre-Raphaelites rather than of the Spanish school, the instances in which he most nearly approaches the latter being clearly traceable to influences which are traditional and literary rather than personal and psychological. Take, for instance, the exquisite and delicate little poem

ON THE WOUNDS OF OUR LORD CRUCIFIED.

Oh, these wakeful wounds of Thine,
  Are they mouths? or are they eyes?
Be they mouths, or be they eyne
  Each bleeding part some one supplies.

Lo! a mouth! whose full-bloomed lips
  At too dear a rate are roses:
Lo! a bloodshot eye! that weeps,
  And many a cruel tear discloses.

O thou that on this foot hath laid
  Many a kiss and many a tear;
Now thou shalt have all repaid,
  Whatsoe'er thy charges were.

This foot hath got a mouth and lips
  To pay the sweet sum of thy kisses;
To pay thy tears an eye that weeps
  Such of tears, such gems as this is.

The difference only this appears,
  (Nor can the change offend)
The debt is paid in ruby tears
  Which thou in pearls did'st lend.

Of course, the idea of the wounds being eyes and mouths was not original with Crashaw, but can be traced to a very early date. Moreover, various devotions to the Five Wounds had been very popular in England as early as the first decade of the fifteenth century. The Pilgrimage of Grace carried the banner of the Five

Wounds as a standard, and instances might be multiplied to prove the hold which this devotion had taken upon the English mind. But after all is said we have here something which is original with Crashaw, a delicacy of expression and tendency to the literary conceit—note the rubies and pearls—which did not come from the old devotional language which inspired some portions of the poem.

A good sample of his mysticism is found in St. Mary Magdalene (s. vi., v. 37), where, after speaking of the angels as holding crystal vials, we have the line, "Their Master's Water, their own Wine." In the ecstasy of his devotion his mind is abnormally active: he thinks instantly of the wine and water presented at the altar, at the offertorium and then of the miracle at Cana of Galilee.

The conceit in Crashaw has a similar origin, as can be seen from a few lines of the poem on the Nativity:

> She sings Thy tears to sleep and dips
> Her kisses in Thy weeping eye.
> She spreads the red leaves of Thy lips
> That in their buds yet blushing lie.
> She 'gainst those mother diamonds tries
> The points of her young eagle's eyes.

The gentle kiss of the Virgin upon the tear-wet eyes of the Christ-child immediately suggests the old idea of the bee—a type of the ever-Virgin Mary—gathering dew drops; so we get immediately the rose suggested by the rosy lips and the unformed, child-like character of the lips described as buds. Again, the sense of sight catches a resemblance to diamonds in the tears (already thought of as dew), and that sets up the association of the unnatural natural history and we have the eagle part of this elaborate conceit. The conceit in Crashaw is, like his mysticism, the result of a certain flashing suddenness in establishing psychological associations.

The original religious poems all show the influence of the Spanish mystics and of his friendship with Farrar. "The Hymn to St. Teresa," "The Apology," "The Flaming Heart," "The Tear" and "The Weeper" are all of them too long to be reprinted here, and selections are bound to be unsatisfactory. Some idea of the style can, however, be gathered from the following lines taken from "The Hymn to St. Teresa:"

> Sweet, not so fast! lo, thy fair Spouse,
> Whom thou seekest with so swift vows,
> Calls thee back and bids thee come
> T' embrace a milder martyrdom.
> . . . . . .
> Thou shalt look round and see
> Thousands of crowned souls throng to be
> Themselves thy crown: sons of thy vows,
> The virgin births with which thy sovereign Spouse
> Made fruitful thy full soul. Go now
> And with them all about thee bow
> To Him; put on (He'll say), put on

(My rosy love) that thy rich zone,
Sparkling with thousand flames
Of thousand souls, whose happy names
Heaven keep upon thy score: (Thy bright
Life brought them first to kiss the light
That kindled them to stars) and so
Thou with the Lamb, thy Lord, shalt go,
And wheresoe'er He sets His white
Steps, walk with Him whose ways are light,
Which who in death would live to see,
Must learn in life to die, like thee.

Here as in all his work the imagery is rich and of what Mr. Swinburne has called "dazzling intricacy." It is almost invariably in terms of sight and in spectrum colors rather than mere brightness. His color sense is evidently perfectly healthy and shows none of those peculiarities which so frequently surprise us in the mystical literature of our own day. He sees red and purple equally well and seems to have a real fondness for yellow. The few auditory references in his poems are perfectly normal, as are also those of the sense of touch. Mere form, however, does not appeal to him, and there is no mention of odors which have played so large a part in our English verse since Keats. His joy in nature and responsiveness thereto was remarkable for a seventeenth century author, although, of course, not as pronounced as in our modern nature poets. "New Year's Day" has a particularly definite color scheme:

Rise, thou best and brightest morning!
  Rosy with a double red,
With thine own blush thy cheeks adorning
  And the dear drops this day were shed.

All the purple pride that laces
  The crimson curtains of thy bed,
Guilds thee not with so sweet graces
  Nor sets thee in so rich a red.

Of all the fair-cheeked flowers that fill thee,
  None so fair thy bosom shows
As this modest maiden lily
  Our sins have shamed into a rose.

Bid thy golden god, the sun,
  Burnished in his best beams, rise,
Put all his red-eyed rubies on,
  These rubies shall put out his eyes.

. . . . . .

When he hath done all he may
  To make himself rich in his rise,
All will be darkness to the day
  That breaks from one of these bright eyes.

And soon this sweet truth shall appear,
  Dear Babe, ere many days be done;
The Morn shall come to meet Thee here,
  And leave her own neglected sun.

Here are beauties shall bereave him
  Of all his eastern paramours,
His Persian lovers all shall leave him
  And swear faith to Thy sweet powers;
Nor while they leave him shall they lose the sun,
  But in thy fairest eyes find two for one.

The first two stanzas suggest Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet," A. iii., s. 5:

> . . . . What envious streaks
> Do lace the severing clouds in yonder east.

The reference of "all the purple pride that laces the crimson curtains of thy bed" is perhaps, as Grossart suggests, to lilac lace curtains under heavy crimson damask ones; light, fleecy, diaphanous lace-like clouds under the heavy red clouds of sunrise, but this explanation is very gross and can hardly be said to add to our pleasure. There is nothing poetic about an upholsterer's shop or an early Victorian drawing-room—which was, after all, much the same thing.

The "Hymn on the Epiphanie of Our Lord God" is too long to admit of any extended quotation or review, but it is as illuminating as any of the poems if we would understand the man Crashaw in his religious life. However puritanic the father may have been, there was not an ounce of the Puritan in Richard Crashaw—not even the bit which Richard Bagot says is in all Englishmen. He lives and breathes in a sanctified world of sense which the Catholic Christian regards as normal, but in which the Puritan can see no good thing. At times he uses figures which seem almost over the narrow line which separates the sensuous and sensuality, as:

> Oh, little all! in Thy embrace
> The world lies warm and likes her place;
> Nor does her full globe fail to be
> Kissed on both cheeks by Thee.

Then comes the mysticism of it:

> Time is too narrow for Thy year,
> Nor makes the whole world Thy half-sphere.

Also when the chorus sings:

> To Thee Thou day of night, Thou east of west,
> Lo, we at last have found the way:
> To Thee the world's great universal east,
> The general and indifferent day!

Imagine how some of our modern mystics would throw in the capitals!

The first king becomes almost Platonic:

> All circling point, all centering sphere,
> The world's one round eternal year.

Perhaps the most exalted of his lyrical strains are "The Hymn for Holy Name Day" and "The Hymn for the Assumption." The latter is written in rimed cambic pentameters or tetrameters interrupted again and again by an angelic refrain—a paraphrase of the Song of Solomon. It would seem to offer a splendid libretto for a

musical composition. The strong sweep of the verse and its deep devotional feeling are entirely beyond anything in modern English religious poetry, and yet it would be difficult to point out the elements of excellence. From the opening

> Hark! she is called, the parting hour is come;
> Take thy farewell, poor world! Heaven must go home,

until the last

> Come away, come away

of the angel's song the hymn sweeps in majestic cadence and leaves us wondering like the Apostles of old.

The secular poems are less original on the whole and must take their chances in the throng of seventeenth century lyrics. Three stand out from among the rest: "The Music Duel," a dainty and characteristic piece of verse; "Wishes to His Supposed Mistress," familiar (in an abridged form) from its presence in Palgrave's "Golden Treasury," and "An Epitaph Upon a Young Married Couple Dead and Buried Together."

> To these whom Death again did wed,
> This grave's their second marriage bed;
> For though the hand of Fate could force
> 'Twixt soul and body a divorce,
> It could not sunder man and wife
> 'Cause they both lived but one life.
> Peace, good reader, do not weep;
> Peace, the lovers are asleep.
> They, sweet turtles, folded lie
> In the last knot that love could tie.
> And though they lie as they were dead,
> Their pillow stone, their sheets of lead,
> (Pillow hard and sheets not warm)
> Love made the bed; they'll take no harm;
> Let them sleep; let them sleep on,
> Till the stormy night be gone
> And the ternal morrow dawn;
> Then the curtains will be drawn
> And they wake into a light
> Whose day shall never sleep in night.

A critical judgment of Crashaw would be a very different thing from an appreciation penned by a student who has learned to love the gentle poet, and yet we may as well own that his place among the seventeenth century lyricists is not particularly high. Living as he did almost on the threshold of a new poetical era, Crashaw was sublimely unconscious of the great literary movement which was going on around him, and wrote in a style, and with the faults even, of the past. But if we consider him as a devotional poet, the whole situation is changed and his position becomes almost commanding. There is, moreover, another fact which lends interest to the study of Crashaw's poems; the poet's mind was of a type which is and always has been exceedingly rare among Englishmen. His

strong mystical tendencies, his sensitiveness and his whole mental constitution are almost unique in our literature, and we cannot help wishing that we knew something of the poet's mother. The scholar of Peterhouse and the English exile we know, but we can only guess at early influences which surrounded this disciple of St. Teresa.

WATSON BARTEMUS SELVAGE.

MR. MALLOCK ON SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

IT may seem a work of supererogation to offer any adverse criticism of Mr. Mallock's recent work, "Religion as a Credible Doctrine," its manifold shortcomings being so painfully evident; but inasmuch as even the most ponderous of English quarterlies have seen fit to take the volume seriously and have dealt with it in all sober and solemn earnest, a dignity has thus been conferred upon it which it by no means merits. For this reason it may not be altogether out of place to expose the utter shallowness of this the latest of the literary curiosities which the so-called conflict of science and religion has inflicted on a long-suffering generation.

Mr. Mallock has long been before the reading public. He is neither a very profound thinker nor a very acute reasoner. He is, however, a pleasing writer, and he seems to have a turn of mind which leads him to select serious subjects. He is not a scientist; he is not a theologian; he is not a philosopher; but he has a sufficient acquaintance with the trend of modern ideas to permit him to play the part of one or other of all three, as his fancy may dictate. Indeed, in science, in philosophy, in theology he affects the rôle of the dilettante, and in spite of a marked weakness for antithesis which soon becomes monotonous, his books dealing with those subjects have commanded attention—sometimes even respect. But even the orbits of popular writers have, it would seem, their perigee and apogee; and this is true of the dilettante in philosophy and theology quite as well as of the dilettante in literature, science or the arts. Mr. Mallock's latest book is a conclusive proof of this; for if his best known work, "Is Life Worth Living?" marks the point at which Mr. Mallock's genius was at perihelion, "Religion as a Credible Doctrine" as surely indicates the point at which it was at aphelion.

The task which Mr. Mallock has undertaken is a very ambitious one. Most people would regard it as absolutely hopeless; for, if we are to take his own word for it, it is nothing more or less than that of reconciling contradictions. Mr. Mallock pronounces science and religion in hopeless contradiction, and yet, nothing loath, he, with an alacrity that is inspiring, undertakes the impossible task of harmonizing them, and what is more, he seems—to his own satisfaction at least—to have accomplished it. Indeed, never did sane man address himself to thesis more remarkable than Mr. Mallock's. Briefly his thesis is this: Religion, by a process of argumentation both palpably false and "hopelessly futile," has in some unaccountable way succeeded in reasoning itself into right conclusions; while science, on the other hand, by a process of argument unexceptionally sound and absolutely "invulnerable," has, in some mysterious manner, only succeeded in reasoning itself into wrong conclusions. From these data, solve the mystery. This is Mr. Mallock's thesis in brief; and aside from the thesis itself there is no other evidence of insanity in the work, although of unsound knowledge and unsound reasoning there is enough and to spare. To the unraveling of this Chinese puzzle Mr. Mallock devotes his entire work, while the reader in wonderment asks:

> Can such things be
> And overcome us like a summer's cloud
> Without our special wonder?

Yet Mr. Mallock is very modest about the astounding feat. At the very outset he undertakes to belittle the nature of his wonderful achievement. He very humbly reminds the reader that his work is not that of either the scientist or the theologian, but a task far "humbler"—that of a mere "accountant." In view, however, of the extraordinary undertaking and its still more extraordinary accomplishment, it is difficult not to suspect that, in spite of all his protestations, Mr. Mallock's humility is not quite genuine. We cannot forget that Uriah Heep, according to his own asseverations, was the "umblest" of men, as his mother, Mrs. Heep, was, on her own recognizances, the "umblest" of women. Unless both Southey and Coleridge have grossly belied his Satanic majesty, that gentleman also once

> . . . . Owned with a grin,
> That his favorite sin,
> Is pride that apes humility.

And in view of the fact that Mr. Mallock declares himself the self-constituted arbiter of the most important questions which can engage the attention of mankind; that before himself as a board of arbitration he summons both science and religion for an adjustment of their differences; that he establishes his own capacious mind as a

sort of intellectual clearing-house for the whole realm of science as well as for the entire religious world, where both religion and science may rely on having an accurate "summing-up" of debits and credits and a proper arrangement of their respective balances; in view of this gigantic undertaking on the part of one man, we think it is fair to infer a *humilitas cum hamo* when we hear the self-constituted "intellectual accountant" speak of such a task as "limited and unambitious" and "the work of a much humbler person" than either the scientist or the theologian.

A further reason for suspecting the sincerity of Mr. Mallock's humility is the exceeding jealousy which he manifests in his new office of intellectual "accountant" and the pains he takes to exclude scientists on the one hand and theologians on the other from any participation in the colossal labor. Mr. Mallock—in order to secure a monopoly, it is to be presumed—at once proceeds to declare both these specialists unfitted for the work. Both are flatly told that it "is not a task which properly belongs to either." The "leaders of scientific thought" are, he informs them, in a position which "tends to unfit them for a full understanding" of the nature of the work to be accomplished. The "theologians are in a position that is no better." Fortunately, however, both for science and religion, Mr. Mallock occupies a neutral ground between both and, according to his own estimate of his powers, is of just the proper calibre, equipment, and accomplishment for a skilful execution of the task—indeed, may have been providentially raised up for its special fulfillment. It will thus be seen that Mr. Mallock's enterprise closely resembles the undertaking of Mr. Herbert Spencer in his synthetic philosophy. In effect it is nothing more than an abbreviated form of Mr. Spencer's gigantic folly. The result is equally disastrous. The execution is only somewhat more elliptical. Indeed, Mr. Mallock has clearly demonstrated on almost every page of his work that he is the last person living who should have attempted such a task; for almost every page of that work bears evidence that either he has totally misapprehended the values in the "accounts" on both sides, or that if he understood, he has wilfully misrepresented, them. In this article we propose to examine Mr. Mallock's qualifications for the duty he has undertaken.

Let us deal first with Mr. Mallock's appraisal of religious values. His new method of representing the defense of Christianity will be somewhat surprising to those who imagined themselves familiar with the subject. Wholly ignoring what has ever been recognized as the logical method of procedure, Mr. Mallock sets up three religious propositions of his own selection, makes them the subject of scientific inquiry, and assures his readers that all religion "must

stand or fall" with these isolated propositions. These three propositions are: the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and the freedom of man's will. It is needless to say that no defender of supernatural religion ever undertook to arrange a defense of Christianity in this order. It is much as if an enemy should insist that the colonels of the opposing army should stand out and be shot, bearing the entire brunt of the battle, while the rank and file of the soldiery were commanded to stand by with folded arms. This novel arrangement of Christian apologetics Mr. Mallock does not attempt, it is true, without much misgiving and profuse apology. He candidly admits that these three propositions will "not give us a living religion." He plainly confesses that they "are co-extensive with none." He apologizes for substituting this creation of his own fancy for religion and undertakes to give his reasons in justification of the unwarranted liberty.

The reasons which Mr. Mallock gives "for thus limiting the meaning of the word religion" are the following: First he tells us that an assent to these three propositions "is essential to every religion," though, as we have seen, he candidly admits that they are "co-extensive with none." Next we are told that "these propositions form also the sole points at which religion, as apart from revelation, comes into collision with science." Then again Ernest Haeckel has seen fit to call these propositions "the three buttresses of superstition." And lastly, "in its task of emancipating the enslaved spirit of man it (science) will fight neither with small nor with great, save with these propositions only." This, then, is the extraordinary "summing-up" of religion's side of the account. Out of the whole scheme of Christianity these three propositions are—to carry out Mr. Mallock's allegory—the sum total of the assets of religion, and their par value depends wholly upon whether they are in agreement or non-agreement with to-day's teachings of science upon these points.

It may be remarked in passing that Mr. Mallock does not pretend to claim that science has disproved any one of these three propositions, but merely that as far as science *now* knows about these matters—which, to be sure, is not very much—its conclusions or, more correctly, its assumptions do not harmonize with the teachings of religion. What we are here interested in just now, however, is Mr. Mallock's wilful or ignorant perversion of the defense of Christianity. He would limit it to these three propositions. He says that when he speaks "of religion" in the present volume he means "an assent to these propositions as statements of objective fact." He maintains that for all purposes of controversy "these three propositions are practically religion itself, and we need, in the present inquiry, trouble ourselves about nothing else." And this singular

presentation of the cause of Christianity being made, Mr. Mallock in true Quixotic fashion proceeds to the demolition of these windmills of Christian apologetics. Nor will it do for Mr. Mallock to say that it is not Christianity, but religion in general he is examining; for, throughout the entire extraordinary volume, it is Christianity which is on trial—and Christianity as represented by Catholic writers.

Now, the fact is that Mr. Mallock has wholly mistaken the nature of Christian apologetics. Important and solemn as are the three propositions which he places on trial, two of them are by no means primary. The existence of God does indeed stand at the very forefront of all religious inquiry; but the same may not be said of the free will of man or, singular as it may seem, even of the immortality of the soul. These doctrines are indeed vital to religion as we understand it—to Christianity they are even cardinal—but they are not in the true sense of the word fundamental. Mr. Mallock has wholly failed to grasp the manner in which the religious problem appeals to the human intellect. That order is not by fits and starts or by leaps and bounds, jerking out disconnected propositions here and there to furnish targets for fools or merry-andrews. It is, on the contrary, a chain of closest logical reasoning in which every strand is double-tried and in which link fits into link with convincing firmness and precision. For the benefit of Mr. Mallock let us briefly summarize the logical form of this intellectual appeal.

The process would run somewhat in this fashion: "I find myself here—a thinking, intelligent, rational being. I am quite sure that I am not here of my own volition, neither am I of my own making. Whence am I then? My intelligence, if it tells me anything at all, tells me that I must be the work of a being superior to myself. What, then, are my relations to this power which has placed me here? I find that reason tells me that the universe which I find surrounding me is not capable of producing me—it is not capable of producing itself; most probably the same power which has placed me here has placed the universe here also. All philosophy points to this conclusion. For me, therefore, as far as my intellect guides me, I must regard both myself and the universe as manifestations of that otherwise unknown power, and from both learn what I can of that power and of my relations to it." This is the first step in the inquiry.

And then comes another question as the logical sequence of this. It is: "This power having manifested itself in myself and in the universe, can it or can it not manifest itself to me in any other way? If so, has it done so? It is claimed that it has so mani-

fested itself. What are the proofs? Are they trustworthy? If so, what are the new relations revealed through this other manifestation?"

This, it seems to us, is the basis of the religious argument, and yet we have not touched upon two of Mr. Mallock's propositions at all. The immortality of the soul and the freedom of the human will have not yet even come upon the horizon. Mr. Mallock has wholly misconceived the relative importance of the propositions upon which he has expended so many vain words. Hence all this portion of his work is a Love's Labor Lost. Indeed, it might be safely argued that if any facts of science seemed to contradict (which they by any means do not) the doctrines of immortality and free-will, the matter would not, as Mr. Mallock supposes, be thereby settled, for the claims of those doctrines which rest on the second manifestation just mentioned would still remain to be dealt with—at least until that manifestation was shown to be untrustworthy. It is indeed true that if the immortality of the soul and the freedom of the will were proven to be false, there would be little left of religion as Christianity conceives it; but it is equally true that science has proved nothing and can prove nothing whatever against these doctrines. And when science has said its last word upon these subjects, even as represented by Mr. Mallock, the strength of these doctrines is hardly at all impaired; for the stronghold of proof upon these points is not science, but revelation, and the duty of the scientist in such a case would consist not in showing the falsity of the doctrines in themselves, but in proving the untrustworthiness of the revealed message of which they formed a part. Hence, doubtless, when Father Driscoll and Father Maher (whose writings Mr. Mallock so frequently challenges) undertake to deal with these questions from a scientific standpoint, they are in all probability doing (we have not seen their works) what Christian apologists are doing every day. They leave the citadel in all its unmolested security and strength and go out to do battle with the scientists on their own grounds. An occasional sortie of this kind, however, leaves the real fortress not only unshaken, but unassailed. Hence an examination of Mr. Mallock's treatment of these propositions would be wholly superfluous. The doctrines may indeed be, as Professor Haeckel has told Mr. Mallock, "buttresses of" religious superstition, but they are not fundamental. It is indeed singular that Mr. Mallock should make so great a blunder; but we know of no remedy save that Mr. Mallock start over again, and that when he starts he be sure of his ground. Not even the fact that Ernest Haeckel calls these doctrines "the three buttresses of superstition" will justify Mr. Mallock in his high-handed proceeding. No theo-

logian has ever selected these doctrines as the bulwarks of Christianity. They have their importance, it is true, but Mr. Mallock can never force them into undue prominence or out of their natural position. Consequently, whether these points have, from the scientific side, been well or illy defended by Catholic apologists is a matter of no very great concern. The whole scheme of Christianity stands or falls together. It is not to be taken piecemeal, like Captain Boabdil's method of defeating an army. Mr. Mallock may concede all its preposterous claims to scientific atheism, or pantheism, or materialism, or whatever else the latest fancy may choose to call it, but he cannot be permitted to misrepresent Christianity's method of defense or assign to its doctrines a relative importance which they have never possessed. Christian defense has never been on the points of immortality or free-will, but along the lines of a first cause, which manifests itself first through the visible universe and next through revelation. Either Mr. Mallock has been disingenuous on this point or he has deceived himself. It is difficult to believe that a man of Mr. Mallock's intelligence could be ignorant of the Christian scheme. Indeed, it is almost impossible in reading his book to divert the mind of the suspicion that Mr. Mallock deliberately chose a false view of Christianity and expatiated upon it simply because he wanted very badly to write a paradoxical book. What would be thought of the "accountant," as Mr. Mallock calls himself, who, while giving full value to one side of the ledger and never questioning its statements, selects one or two items from the opposite side, and having used every means in his power to discredit them, finally concluded from such proceeding not only that the culled items were unreliable, but that the entire side of the ledger from which they were taken was unveracious and untrustworthy?

While, however, Mr. Mallock tries to minimize the front which religion opposes to science, he is not so scrupulous in allowing the claims of science itself. Indeed, one reads with wonder and amazement the concessions so prodigally made in its behalf. Everything passes ts science with Mr. Mallock. Its most unsubstantial and unsupported surmises he endows with all the dignity of established facts. Theory, hypothesis, conjecture, assumption—all are encircled with a halo of scientific sanctity which it were sacrilege to touch. To Mr. Mallock the very guesses of science seem sacred. Even the wildest dreams of Ernest Haeckel are accepted as the unquestioned facts and conclusions of science. That the scientists themselves should entertain an absurdly exaggerated notion of the importance of their assumptions is not surprising. Indeed, the extent of the exaggeration is usually in indirect ratio to the value of

the assumption or the intellectual standing of the scientist. But that Mr. Mallock should make an act of faith openly in all the assumptions of modern science and place implicit confidenec in modern methods, adopting not only the uncontroverted facts and legitimate conclusions, but all the lacunæ in the evidence for doubtful hypotheses as well, is what we think no former reader of Mr. Mallock was exactly prepared for. The fact is, however, that Mr. Mallock out-Darwins Darwin, leaves Spencer and Huxley far in the rear and is fully abreast with Professor Haeckel himself in his unquestioning submission to the dogmatism of latter-day scientific pretension. This full confession of faith in science and its methods Mr. Mallock makes in his parodoxical statement of the task which he sets out to fulfill. He says:

"I shall seek to show that the latter (the class which defends religion) is right in its final conclusions, but is seeking to support them by methods hopelessly futile. I shall seek to show that the former (the class which opposes science to religion) is in its conclusions wrong; but that the aarguments which it adduces to support them are in themselves invulnerable."

We need not dwell here on the extraordinary and wholly paradoxical state of things described in this brief paragraph. What we are interested in here is "the arguments" of science which Mr. Mallock declares to be "invulnerable." We must confess that we have looked with much curiosity through Mr. Mallock's entire volume for those "arguments" of science which he pronounces "invulnerable," but in vain. We have sought for conclusions of science which are "incontrovertible" and which are opposed to religion, but we have failed to find them. Mr. Mallock does not mention any. We have looked for authenticated facts of a similar nature, but aside from one or two doubtful citations in favor of evolution and one or two irrelevant illustrations from psychology, to both of which we may allude later, Mr. Mallock has failed to supply them. The fact is that Mr. Mallock has failed to adduce from the whole realm of science a single fact or a single conclusion upon whose truth the testimony of scientists agrees, or which rises above the level of unproved hypothesis, and which is opposed to religion in any form. We have seen how Mr. Mallock erred in his estimate of religion, by defect; we shall see now that in an opposite direction he has erred against true science by excess. In a word, as we have shown that Mr. Mallock is incapable of estimating values in religion, he is also incapable of estimating values in science. This will be his best refutation.

The first thing that strikes us, in taking inventory of the "arguments" of science which we are to regard as "invulnerable," is the

charming naïveté with which Mr. Mallock tells us that science must now be right because it has discovered that formerly it was wrong. Science has, he tells us, changed front completely on the doctrine of "materialism." He candidly admits that it has been compelled to do so by religious thinkers. He pleads guilty, for science, to the "opprobrium" of its ald teachings. He rejoices because science has rid itself of "the kind of intellectual discredit which rightly attaches itself to materialism." But now he expects religion to regard the new position as "invulnerable," and for no other reason, that we can perceive, than that it is not the old. "Science," he admits, "has at all events been driven to go to school to philosophy, which at first it neglected or scouted with a boorishness born of ignorance; and the result of its education is seen to be this—that the materialism which it was content to profess or assume yesterday is to-day universally abandoned by it; or rather is transfigured into something which is the opposite of its former self."

Surely here is reason enough for religion to bow down to the infallibility of science. And if religion will not accept the plea and henceforth regard science as invulnerable, religion must indeed be hard-hearted. Science has been wrong, but—it has at last admitted its error, although, it is quite true, it admitted it only when compelled by religion to do so. It is now quite ashamed of its former position, and though it has not yet quite come around to the views of religion, it must now be admitted to be right, for the simple reason that it has abandoned the old, crude, shameful blunder. Mr. Mallock's plea here is irresistible. He says:

"Their (the scientists') old, their crude doctrine, that mind is the product of matter, they now completely metamorphose by adding that, with even greater truth (save the mark!), we may look on matter as a manifestation of mind."

Perhaps there never was a more extraordinary plea put forward for the acceptance of a scientific theory than that which Mr. Mallock here advances in favor of scientific monism. It is nothing more or less than this: Science was wrong in maintaining monism when monism consisted in a belief in the existence of matter solely; but now that, thanks to religion, science has been forced to shift its position and admit its former error, surely religion will not be unreasonable enough to question it when it makes its monism consist in the sole existence not of matter, but of mind? Lest we might be suspected of misrepresenting Mr. Mallock on this point—so singular in its naïveté—let us quote Mr. Mallock himself still further. He adds:

"Materialism, in fact, with the old opprobrium attached to it, has practically lost its place among the terms and the ideas of con-

troversy. No man of sciene who can make any claim to being a thinker, or is anything more than an expert but half-educated specialist, is now a materialist in the old sense of the word. The opposition between science and religion, though not less acute than formerly, is no longer an opposition between a materialistic philosophy and a spiritualistic. It is an opposition between a monistic philosophy and a dualistic."

Here, then, Mr. Mallock fully admits that religion has not swerved one single iota from its original teaching, while science has been compelled to abandon its former teachings and invent new doctrines. Under the circumstances it is a somewhat extravagant demand upon religion to ask it to regard the new doctrine of science as "invulnerable."

We are not, however, yet done with the new monistic theory which we are to regard as "invulnerable." The new doctrine is that since science has changed front and now claims that matter is no longer matter but spirit, the fact that it is spirit dispenses with God, and hence we have not a dualism, but a monism. Now, the truth is that the new monism of spirit is quite as unsupported in evidence as was the old monism of matter. In spite of all Mr. Mallock's claims for it, it stands on no stronger ground than did the crude materialism of which men of science, as Mr. Mallock tells us, are now ashamed. What are the facts of science that go to prove its truth? What are the "incontrovertible" reasons upon which it is founded? Absolutely none. It is a theory not one whit more respectable than the abandoned materialism which it has replaced and for which men of science are now blushing. It is a theory—like materialism—invented to meet an exigency of science. The best that Mr. Mallock can say of it is that it "may be erroneous, but it is not . . . . obviously irrational." He is forced to admit that it does not explain "all phenomena," though he claims that t will explain "an enormous part of them." This claim he modifies, however, by the very significant clause "within certain limits." We have not the space to follow Mr. Mallock in his description of this mental monism (which after all proves to be nothing but matter) or in his contrast between it and the personal God of religion. All we need do here is to emphasize the fact that, according to Mr. Mallock's own showing, it is merely a theory without any sure foundation into which some materialists have been driven by the arguments in favor of religion; that it is admitted it may be "erroneous;" that it "cannot account for all the facts" to which the new mind-materialism would apply it, and, lastly, that the best that can be said in its favor is that it is not "obviously irrational"—all of which seems to Mr. Mallock to be the scientific synonym for the

epithet "invulnerable." What guarantee has religion that the scientists will not be as much ashamed of the modern mind-matter monism ten years from now as they are to-day of the old, crude material monism? Why should religion trouble itself at all to chase a rainbow science and beg it to do battle with it? Will science warrant that there will not be another theory of the universe—quite as "invulnerable" as monism past and present, material or spiritual—before the rising of another sun? It is supreme folly to undertake to readjust the religious position to every will-o'-the-wisp vagary of modern science.

There is just one other feature of this item of scientific assets which deserves attention. It is that Mr. Mallock has no scruple in passing off the new monism on his readers as sterling value in science, and as bearing the stamp of the scientific mint. Now, nothing could be more misleading. Mr. Mallock speaks of monism as though it were adopted by the universal consent of scientists. Truth is, the doctrine is not accepted by any one worthy of the name of scientist at all. There may indeed be a school of fledglings who follow Ernest Haeckel. But when we come to question the giants in modern science—the Virchows, the Pasteurs, the Lord Kelvins, and even such men as George Romanes, Alfred Wallace, even Darwin himself, we shall find that they all stand not for monism, either material or mental, but for dualism, and dualism in the sense of the term as accepted by religion. When Mr. Mallock, therefore, attempts to palm off the doctrine as a product of "modern science," he shows himself as unfit for the task he has undertaken as when he pronounced the doctrine "invulnerable." Evidently Mr. Mallock has never heard of Edmund Burke's famous metaphor, or at least has failed to profit by it. When he enters the field of science he seems to see or hear nothing but the "chirping grasshoppers" so noisily obtrusive in the corners. The quiet cud-chewing, deep-chested kine occupying the same field—and the only things of value in it—he passes over unnoticed. Yet only the other day one of these told us "Science positively affirms Creative Power. . . . We cannot escape from that conclusion when we study the physics and dynamics of living and dead matter all around." And again: "If you think strongly enough you will be forced by science to belief in God, which is the foundation of all religion." Surely this is a dualism that is unequivocal. Yet Mr. Mallock would have the world believe that "modern science" teaches only monism. Whom shall we believe, Mr. Mallock or Lord Kelvin?

It is quite evident, then, whether or no we accept what Mr. Mallock tries to impose upon the world as the apology for religion as the reality in religion, that when we come to the region of

science, what he undertakes to impose upon us as science is not entitled to the name of science at all.

When we come to the views of individual scientists we find in the same way that Mr. Mallock is singularly unfamiliar with their real teachings. For example, he roundly censures Christian apologists for their disbelief in spontaneous generation, and directly charges them with misrepresenting the views of scientists upon this point. Father Maher especially he undertakes to bring to book and openly accuses him of suborning evidence in his own favor upon this point. He says:

> Even men as fair-minded as Father Maher, in their zeal for their own view, unintentionally misrepresent—we might almost say invert—what the leading men of science have really said on the subject. Thus Father Maher confidently quotes Tyndall and Huxley as affirming that living beings are produced only from living beings, and that the theory of spontaneous generation has not "a single shred of evidence" to support it. What they really say is something totally different. . . . . That it has taken place in the past is the very thing they affirm, and they hold that this view is supported by all the analogies of the universe.

Here, then, is a flat contradiction of Father Maher and "our religious apologists" in which they—and Father Maher in particular—are charged with "misrepresenting" and even "inverting" the teachings of the scientists. Now, one would suppose that Mr. Mallock would have alluded to the particular work in which he finds this contradiction, or that in a case of accusation of misrepresentation he would have quoted the words of Tyndall or Huxley. But he does neither the one nor the other. Now what are the facts? When we come to Huxley we find, it is true, in his lay sermon on spontaneous generation, opinions coinciding with those which Mr. Mallock attributes to him. This, however, was early in Huxley's career. Pasteur's immortal labors in the cause of biogenesis had not yet changed the views of the scientific world. When those views did come, we find that Huxley was not slow to adopt them, and consequently, in the seven or eight years that had elapsed between the famous lecture on spontaneous generation and his essay in the Encyclopædia Brittanica on "Evolution in Biology," an extraordinary change had, thanks to Pasteur, come over the spirit of Huxley's dream, and in the latter work he tells us in no equivocal terms:

> But while the course of modern investigation has only brought out into greater prominence the accuracy of Harvey's conception of the nature and mode of development of germs, it has as distinctly tended to disprove the occurrence of equivocal generation, or abiogenesis, in the present course of nature. In the immense majority of both plants and animals it is certain that the germ is not merely a body in which life is dormant or potential, but that it is itself simply a detached portion of the substance of a pre-existing living body; and the evidence has yet to be adduced which will satisfy any cautious reasoner that "omne vivum ex vivo" is not as well established a law of the existing course of nature as "omne vivum ex ovo."

That Mr. Mallock was ignorant of this is not, perhaps, to be

wondered at; but that he should, in his ignorance, presume also on the ignorance of his readers, and have the hardihood to challenge Father Maher's statement and charge him with misrepresentation upon this point, is the very essence of unpardonable effrontery.

The same is true of Tyndall. Whatever his views before Pasteur's brilliant experiments, there is no doubt regarding them afterwards. He even took up the defense of Pasteur in British journals. M. Vallery-Radot, in his most interesting Life of Pasteur, tells us that "Pasteur's experiments had been strongly attacked by a young English physician, Dr. Bastian, who had excited in the English and American public a bitter prejudice against the results announced by Pasteur on the subject of spontaneous generation."

"The confusion and uncertainty," wrote Tyndall to Pasteur (we are quoting from M. Vallery-Radot), "have finally become such that, six months ago, I thought that it would be rendering a service to science, at the same time as justice to yourself, if the question were subjected to a fresh investigation. . . . . I went over a large portion of the ground in which Dr. Bastian had taken up his stand, and refuted, I think, many of the fallacies which had misled the public.

"The change which has taken place since then in the tone of the English medical journals is quite remarkable, and I am disposed to think that the general confidence of the public in the accuracy of Dr. Bastian's experiments has been considerably shaken."

And in point of fact Tyndall himself conducted experiments in England, in the Alps and elsewhere, along the same lines as Pasteur, and in every instance the results coincided with those reported by Pasteur. In the face of all this what must be thought of Mr. Mallock's ignorant arraignment of Father Maher and religious apologists? His ignorance of the subject upon which he undertakes to write is equaled only by the effrontery of his charges. This single incident is sufficient to show his utter unfitness for the task he has undertaken and how wholly unreliable are his statements. We shall, however, cite one more instance of Mr. Mallock's reckless statements.

After what we have here seen, the reader is not surprised to find that Mr. Mallock "swallows Darwin whole;" though it is a question if he fully understands the famous doctrine. From the undue weight he attaches to some of the arguments, it would hardly be rash to infer that he does not fully comprehend their nature. The curiosity of the reader is aroused when Mr. Mallock, in his usual tone of universal superiority to "our religious apologists," querulously tells them:

What our religious apologists, however, fail to understand is this, that whilst, on the one hand, lacunæ have been discovered in the class of evidence with which, in a special manner, the name of Darwin is associated, other evidences of the doctrine for which Darwin contended—namely, the essential unity of man with the other animals—have accumulated in overwhelming strength, and have done more to make the doctrine a demon-

strable, indeed a visible, fact than any of the detected lacunæ have done or can do to cast doubt upon it.

The reader, like Hamlet's queen, when he gets so far is apt to be almost breathless with curiosity, if not with interest, and, like her, is apt to wonderingly inquire what is the startling intelligence "which so thunders in the preface?" A feeling of disappointment is apt to come over him, however, when he reads somewhat eagerly the news itself. Mr. Mallock thus tells it:

The evidences to which I am here referring are those supplied us by embryology (!)—a science to which Darwin always looked with confidence as the most important of the witnesses by whose evidence his case would be established.

Now, nothing could be more haphazard than this assertion. That Darwin laid stress on embryology—as he laid stress on everything which he imagined made for his theory—is indeed true. But that he regarded it as "the most important of all the witnesses by which his case would be established" is quite an amazing statement. Still more amazing, however, is the statement that "the evidences supplied us by embryology" have "accumulated in overwhelming strength," and have made man's evolution "a demonstrable, indeed, a visible fact." The fact is that embryology has advanced but little since Darwin's day. There was nothing to look forward to, for the most important lessons of embryology had been learned during his lifetime. No one knew better than Darwin himself not only the value of embryology as a proof of his doctrine, but also the difficulties which that branch of science opposed to his theory. Von Baer, perhaps the greatest authority on embryology who ever lived—who may, indeed, be called the father of the modern science—ridiculed Darwin's doctrine. The importance which he attached to the proof from embryology, which Mr. Mallock regards as so overwhelming, can be estimated by the fact that he characterized it as a wool-gathering tale, "ein volles märchen." Darwin himself fully recognized the objections to the "proof from embryology," as Mr. Spencer calls it, and feebly attempted to meet them. Out of the many difficulties which have never been satisfactorily answered let us simply mention two or three, in Darwin's own words. 1. "The very general, though not universal, difference in structure between the embryo and the adult." 2. "The various parts in the same individual embryo, which ultimately become very unlike and serve for diverse purposes, (though) being at an early period of growth alike." 3. "The fact of certain larvæ standing higher in the scale of organization than the mature animal into which they are developed." These are some of the principal difficulties in the proof of evolution from embryology which Mr. Mallock tells us is now so "overwhelming"

—difficulties fully recognized by Darwin himself, by even such an enthusiastic evolutionist as Mr. Herbert Spencer, by Sedgwick, by Agassiz and others. Yet Mr. Mallock in his utter recklessness of statement would have his readers believe that the evidences "from embryology" are overwhelming in their "strength," and that they have made the evolution of man from an ape "a demonstrable, indeed, a visible fact." The real fact is that Darwin, like most of his followers, "looked with confidence" not to embryology, but to the geological record for the confirmation of the evolutionary theory. Let Huxley speak for the whole school. He tells us:

> Primary and direct evidence in favor of evolution can be furnished only by palaeontology. The geological record, as soon as it approaches completeness, must, when properly questioned, yield either an affirmative or a negative answer: if evolution has taken place, there will its mark be left; if it has not taken place, there will lie its refutation.

These words are taken from his famous address on the occasion of "The Coming of Age of the Origin of Species," for which he was the specially chosen orator. They represent the thought of Darwin and his entire school. Yet for the "modern methods of hardening and section-making" and all the other evidence which embryology furnishes, Huxley simply claimed—on this memorable occasion—that they show that evolution "is, at any rate, possible." Here again, then, we find that Mr. Mallock has discovered a veritable mare's nest, and that as an exponent of scientific views he is wholly as untrustworthy as when he undertakes to expound the views of the defenders of religion.

In like manner, when Mr. Mallock comes to treat of free-will and the determinism of matter, he shows how imperfectly he is acquainted with the views of the scientists who are authority on this particular doctrine. Here again with unabashed assurance he undertakes to convict "our religious apologists," as he styles them, of contradicting the doctrine of the conservation of energy, when they maintain the freedom of the human will. He is careful not to mention the names of the "scientific determinists" whom he quotes or, to put it more correctly, whose views he undertakes to give. Possibly he deemed it wiser to suppress his authorities. Purporting to give the doctrine of science on this point, he tells us:

> The doctrine of free-will is in absolute and direct contradiction to the first laws of science. In especial, it is in direct contradiction to the law of the conservation of energy. It is a doctrine that energy can be annihilated and new energy created; and to maintain this, they say, is no less absurd and monstrous than it would be to maintain that the will can annihilate and create matter. Such is the primary difficulty which modern physical science puts in the way of those who maintain that the will is free.

It is a great pity that Mr. Mallock has not seen fit to say who are the scientists whose views here he makes stand for "modern physical science." Now, the fact is that so little is known about the

doctrine of the conservation of energy that to begin to dogmatize from the imperfect knowledge of the subject is nothing short of the highest folly. The little that can be put in exact form by science can contradict nothing. Only last year at a meeting of the British Association in Belfast, Ireland, the president, Professor Dewar, candidly admitted on behalf of science that it knows absolutely nothing about the nature of energy. He confessed ignorance on the part of science quite as much of the ultimate nature of energy as of the ultimate nature of matter, "and still more of the origin and ultimate synthesis of the two." The late Clerk Maxwell —who as an authority on the subject has not been yet superseded— defines the doctrine in these terms: "The total energy of any body or system of bodies is a quantity which can neither be increased nor diminished *by any mutual action of such bodies*, though it may be transformed into any one of the forms of which energy is susceptible." We have italicized the words "by any mutual action of such bodies" because it seems to be inserted specially for the purpose of not excluding the influx of action—and consequently of energy—from without. Indeed, so certain is this that the late Professor Huxley here, too—as in the case of spontaneous generation—revised his views and amended his opinions. For instance, he once gave to the world the famous utterance: "I believe that we shall, sooner or later, arrive at a mechanical equivalent of consciousness, just as we have arrived at a mechanical equivalent of heat;" and on another occasion, when addressing an audience, he told them: "It must be true . . . . that the thoughts to which I am now giving utterance, and your thoughts regarding them, are the expression of changes in the matter of life which is the source of our other vital phenomena." It reads like a recantation of these doctrines, then, when we find him, in his last work, telling us that "the phenomena of consciousness which arise, along with certain transformations of energy, cannot be interpolated in the series of these transformations, inasmuch as they are not motions to which the doctrine of the transformation of energy applies." In view of this, what are we to think of Mr. Mallock's accusation that religious apologists sin against the doctrine of the conservation of energy when they come to prove the doctrine of free-will?

We shall give just one more instance of Mr. Mallock's wild attempts to discredit Christian apologetics, since to expose them all would be to review his almost every page. Mr. Mallock is dealing with Father Driscoll's admissions on "frustrated purpose," and in order to overwhelm Father Driscoll completely, makes a supreme dramatic effort in which he really surpasses himself. It is his *piece de resistance*. He wishes to convict God of "mad stupidity" and of

"wanton and miserable failures" when He is, as Mr. Mallock puts it, "doing His best to produce" human beings. Turning from the waste of seeds involved in the production of turnips, "let us," he says, "take the waste that is involved in the production of men."

"This process of conception," Mr. Mallock urges, "is necessarily, according to the theist, the very sacrament of God's creation, and must exhibit his skill and resource in the very highest degree."

And Mr. Mallock proceeds in language that is highly blasphemous, and which the late Colonel Ingersoll might envy, to burlesque the Christian idea of the dignity of man. Omitting what cannot be reprinted, we come to his point:

"What can be holier, from the theist's point of view," he asks, "than the male life-bearer which penetrates the female cell, depositing there the seed whose growth will be like the kingdom of heaven? Nothing can be more holy."

And now comes Mr. Mallock's climax.

"Every time," he solemnly assures us, "a woman conceives a child, God, in order to secure that the act of conception shall take place, blindly and recklessly throws away enough of these holy things—enough spermatozoa, enough potential souls (!) to populate the whole city of London or the whole kingdom of Scotland, if only each spermatozoon could meet with an appropriate ovum. He burns down the house to roast the pig."

And then he triumphantly asks:

"What sort of answer can the theist make to this?" And we answer: "What, indeed?" The temptation is exceedingly strong to give to it the answer it deserves. Let us, however, patiently examine this piece of solemn buffoonery. The inference is that science here confronts us with a new scientific difficulty. Well, the first answer is that the difficulty, such as it is, is not new at all. It is as old as human nature. Only the shallowest of minds could regard it as new. If there be any force at all in the difficulty, science has been exceedingly slow in discovering it, and for very shame at its stupidity in not urging it before, should have maintained a discreet silence. For if, as Mr. Mallock would have us believe, it be a blind and reckless throwing away of "holy things" that only one child results from the act of conception, when there ought to result a whole London population, what must be said of the number of conjugal unions from which no human life results at all? Here, indeed, is a wanton and reckless waste of "most precious materials;" and the wonder is that science has not awakened to a recognition of it before. Usually only one conception takes place in twelve months; and science has been all this time blind to this dreadful fact; and has forgotten to inveigh against God or improve the order of nature!

Surely here has been a great opportunity neglected! Evidently science has been caught napping upon this point of divine improvidence!

But there is another answer—one so obvious that even a scientist or Mr. Mallock might have perceived it. It is that perhaps the spermatozoon is not a "holy thing" at all, as Mr. Mallock would devoutly persuade us. According to the showing of science, and according to Mr. Mallock's own statement, which he manages to strangely forget, neither the spermatozoon nor the ovum, of itself, can produce a human being. Either is barren by itself. It is, as Mr. Mallock himself tells us, only "the coalescence" of both that gives us the conception of the human being. Hence, unless there is a wilful destruction of the "coalescence," there is neither "wanton and miserable failure" nor a playing "of ducks and drakes with His own most precious materials" on the part of God. On the contrary, when Mr. Mallock in true Ingersollian fashion, through lack of understanding his own assertions, presumes to call God "only a stupid God" and also "a morally reckless God," he is simply guilty of wanton and reckless blasphemy. The spermatozoon which Mr. Mallock is pleased to burlesque as "a holy thing" is simply, as science tells us, a combination of carbon, nitrogen, hydrogen and oxygen, united into the compound known as protein and associated with much water and a little phosphorus and sulphur. Why should these ingredients be more precious, or holy, or sacred in the form of spermatozoa than in any other form? Mr. Mallock may in jest or earnest look upon all these as sacred if it so pleases him, but of themselves they can never constitute a human being. The coalescence of the spermatozoon and the ovum is necessary, just as the coalition of the flint and steel is necessary to produce the spark, or as the union of the positive and negative electrodes gives the electric spark. What would be thought of the man who in the name of science said that there was a reckless and wanton waste of fire because every quartz rock was not a mass of flame, or because every piece of copper wire did not give forth an electric spark? Mr. Mallock must explain why the carbon or nitrogen or other element of which the spermatozoa are composed should be one whit more precious than carbon or nitrogen in any other form. Hence his sapient judgment that God must be convicted of "stupidity" and "recklessness" and of "playing ducks and drakes with His own most precious materials," because "for every spermatozoon which develops into a human being several millions do not, but find their way to the gutter" instead, is not, as Mr. Mallock would persuade us, "evidence" that God's means to an end "are as a rule wanton and miserable failures." Mr. Mallock's statement of it, however, is

"evidence" that the vilest scurrility cannot be hidden even when under the disguise of blasphemy.

There is no space—nor is it necessary—to follow Mr. Mallock further. There is hardly a page of his work which does not offer the strongest proof that Mr. Mallock is wholly incompetent for the stupendous work he has so rashly undertaken. And yet his strange work may serve a useful purpose. Mr. Mallock's opportunity—of which he has taken so speedy advantage—has arisen, it seems, from the too easy concessions of Catholic apologists to the assumptions of science. It is, indeed, well to be generous even to an adversary, but not to the point of giving him undue advantage. As has already been seen what is masquerading as scientific truth to-day will, to-morrow, in all probability be discarded as scientific error. We have seen how Mr. Mallock admits the complete change of front of materialism which is so wholly metamorphosed that it must now be called mentalism. We have seen the change of opinion of Tyndall and Huxley on the question of spontaneous generation, and also that of Huxley on the conservation of energy. The science of yesterday is not that of to-day, nor will that of to-day stand the test of to-morrow. To undertake to harmonize religion with all this kaleidoscopic change is to the task of Sisyphus over again, or to pursue the mischievous Puck in his knavish challengings. Indeed, science now boasts of its "plasticity;" that is, of the instability of its teachings.

Of Mr. Mallock's solution of the problem there is no room to speak here. Strange to say, however, it is the only portion of his book in which he stumbles on a partial truth. It is not, indeed, true, as he says, that truth can contradict itself; nevertheless his plea that the claims of the moral world as well as those of what he calls "the religious faculty" should have some recognition, is entirely just. The methods of the new Solomon, however, differ somewhat from those of the original. When the two mothers, religion and science, come to Mr. Mallock, each claiming the child, Truth, as hers, the modern Solomon, instead of bisecting the child, undertakes to bisect each of the parents, and by selecting from the parts of each construct the real parent of Truth. It is hardly rash to say that, notwithstanding Mr. Mallock's paradoxical thesis, his lucid exposition and wise solution of it, old-fashioned people will still doubtlessly be found who will insist on maintaining that where the conclusion is wrong the argumentation which leads up to it is apt to be faulty, and that right principles and right reasoning from them is the surest and safest route to right conclusions.

S. FitzSimons.

Lima, N. Y.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF MASSACHUSETTS.

SYNOPSIS—RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE SCHOOLS OF MASSACHUSETTS.

FIRST PERIOD, 1630 to 1775.—Corner-stone of college and school education.
1. Purpose of Harvard College and first schools, 1635.
2. Law of General Court.—1642, religious education compulsory; 1647, schools for it compulsory and free.
3. Unity, harmony, strength, 1642 to about 1700.
4. Division by arrival of Baptists, Quakers, Episcopalians.
5. Lethargy from commercial gain and wars, 1725-1775.
6. Deism of England imported.

SECOND PERIOD, 1775 to 1825.—Rise of private denominational schools.
1. Infiltration of French Atheisms.—Declaration of Independence, United States Constitution, New York University.
2. Influx of people after War of Independence.
3. Unitarian ideas spreading.—Took Harvard, seized churches.
4. Rise and development of academies.
5. Mount St. Benedict Ursuline Academy.
6. Decadence of the common school.

THIRD PERIOD, 1825 to 1900.—Rise of common non-sectarian school, Catholic school system.
1. Danger of the fall of the common school system.
2. Horace Mann: life, influence on education.
3. New common school system, religious but unsectarian, founded on Deism and Unitarianism.
4. Arrival of Irish Catholics.
5. Know-Nothingism.—No public money for sectarian schools, Bible must be read.
6. Gradual secularization of the schools.—Legislation, social changes.
7. Present hope and demand for moral and religious instruction.
8. Catholic school system: fact and idea.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Reports of United States Commissioner of Education.
Massachusetts Legislative Reports.
Massachusetts State Board of Education Reports.
Massachusetts Laws on Education, 1630 to 1900.
Lowell School Board Records, 1830 to 1855.
Life of Horace Mann.
Reports of Secretary Horace Mann.
Evolution of Massachusetts Public School System by George Martin.
Beginnings of New England—Fiske.
New France and New England.
History of the University of State of New York.
History of Massachusetts Academies in State Board Report, 1875-76.
History of the Burning of Mount St. Benedict Convent.
Various histories and pamphlets on Education.

THE great State of Pennsylvania, with its beautiful City of Brotherly Love, like nearly all the important centres of our common beloved country, has felt the influence of the little State of Massachusetts. Small in territory, the old Puritan Commonwealth, or Bay State, was early settled, quite well peopled and strongly organized with a homogeneous element. It secured wealth, developed industry, fostered the arts and sciences and produced men great in commerce, literature and religion, hence spread its influence far and wide over the newer or then less favored but now more dominant communities. From a literary or educational point of

view this influence has ever been and is still most marked, so that whatever the future may bring, no one can ever justly take the crown of educational glory from the fair brow of venerable Massachusetts. I am equally convinced that Massachusetts forsook her ideal, and the right ideal, by eliminating religious and moral training from the public elementary education and thus wrongly influenced the country. This paper is to show how and when and why the fatal divorce was made legal and compulsory, and thus will call for a general survey of the educational development of Massachusetts, not in a didactic or controversial spirit, but simply in historic outline, as pictured in legislation and important historic episodes from 1630 to 1900; for they tell the whole truth. It naturally divides itself into three periods or chapters, the first from 1630 to 1775, the second from 1775 to 1825 and the third from 1825 to 1900.

FIRST PERIOD.

Religious education was the corner-stone in the foundation of the great monument which we call the State of Massachusetts and of which any one may now be proud to be a part. It was the corner-stone of Harvard College, founded by the General Court in 1636: 1, lest an illiterate ministry might be left to the churches; 2, to provide for the instruction of the people in "piety, morality and learning;" 3, beautifully inscribed on its coat-of-arms: "Veritas Christo et Ecclesiæ" or "In gloriam Christi." It was also the corner-stone of the whole educational system. In the year 1642, only twelve years after the settlement of Boston, the General Court ordered and decreed:

"Taking into consideration the great neglect of many parents and guardians in training up their children in learning and labor and other employment, which may be profitable to the Commonwealth . . . that chosen men in every town are to redress this evil, are to have power to take account of parents, masters and of their children, especially of their ability to read and understand the principles of religion and the capital laws of the country."

Three things stand out clearly in this decree:

First. That many parents had shown great neglect in *training up* their children. This does not square with the traditional picture of the first Puritans, of whom Horace Mann has said in one of his many flights of imagination: "In all that company there was not a drop of blood which had been tainted by vice, nor an act of life that had been stained by crime."

Secondly. That education was made compulsory, with the ways and means at the option of each municipality, but not necessarily schools. Schools already existed for the "nourtering," "nourish-

ing" (ideal word) of children, and Harvard College had been founded.

Thirdly. The object of the education is stated, namely, that children may read and understand the *principles of religion* and the *capital laws of the country;* religion first, then citizenship, all secular learning to be a means to both, the handmaid to manly, civic and religious character.

Five years later, in 1647, every town, and there were forty or fifty of them with about 20,000 people, was ordered, under a penalty of a fine, to build and support a school for the above double purpose, and every large town of 100 families a grammar or classical school to fit youth for the university. Hence primary school, grammar or classical school and university were well defined and all had one chief object, the religious and civic training of the people as of the ministry.

It is sometimes imagined that all this was an original idea of the Puritans. Such a notion is far from true; it was one of the many fine ideas imported from England, and given to England by the Catholic Church of Augustine, of Theodore, of King Alfred, of Dunstan, of St. Anselm, of Becket, of Langton, of Fisher and Sir Thomas Moore. The compulsory feature as a State law was new; the universality feature or education for all children was also new, in one sense, and was not carried out, but if the Puritans had such an ardent love and unquenchable thirst for learning and for religion, it is hard to see why the tyranny of compulsion should, by law, replace the liberty of love. No, it was the unconscious continuity of the religious educational work of God and of the Church from the time when our Lard said to His Apostles, "*Teach* all nations," and that continuity has never been broken even in the State of Massachusetts. During the first period, from 1630 to 1775, there was no real modification, by statute law, of the original idea, and the man who would dare to think out loud of holding or "keeping," as it was said, a secular, non-religious school would have been judged an emissary of Satan, and would have been told in plain words to return quick to his fiery abode.

Whatever the motive of the autocratic and theocratic Commonwealth may have been, whether it was religious zeal, or commercial gain, or self-protection or simply Calvinistic intolerance, and perhaps it was one and all of these, unity and harmony were developed and maintained by the supremacy of religion in education. Church and Commonwealth were only two names for the same body, at least in power of government and voting, for no one could vote, much less hold office, who was not a communicant in the Church. The Church authorities made the formal subscription to the Creed and the reve-

lation of personal experience in thinking and planning so stringent, that the religious education was a necessary means to the end of voting, of power, of influence and of wealth. Prayer, reading, writing, spelling, figuring were the course of study. The Bible, the Psalter, the Catechism (Westminster) and the New England Primer were the books used to carry out the purpose. The teachers were ministers or students, graduates usually of Harvard College. It is really wonderful how long these factors held their place and how widespread was their influence long after the spirit that introduced them had lost its hold either as a private monitor of conscience or a standard of public morality. The machinery was in view long after the fires and steam had been withdrawn; the skeleton remained when the soul had taken flight. Let me just recall, without developing, some of the historic signs that point out this certain fact.

1. It is striking, yet not surprising, how the pulse-beat of the mother country's heart was soon felt in the colony so far away.

When Puritanism was dominant or triumphant in England, the Massachusetts legislators made barriers strong and numerous against any intruders. When royalty and the Church of England gained control, the door to Massachusetts was opened a little more.

When a Governor came who was a strong churchman, the Puritans of Boston were rather nervous and conciliatory, and the fear of losing their charter, more than once threatened, made them cautious.

Hence Quakers, Baptists, Episcopalians slipped in from time to time, and though not numerous enough to build churches or to organize schools, asserted themselves often enough to be persecuted and to have laws made against them.

It was only after the middle of the eighteenth century that they were unmolested and put up churches for their own adherents.

2. The witchcraft delusion of 1692, for which my native place, Salem, has had notoriety if not fame, weakened the Puritan ministers in their claim of possessing truth, the Spirit and Prophecy and infallibility, and many people asserted that the Devil was in the clergy rather than in the witches.

3. Commercial gain and the wars with the French and Indians, in which the help of all was needed, made the Puritans less strict about the qualifications of voters and communicants, and produced an apathy in religious matters such as usually follows in their train.

4. The Half-way Covenant in 1650 and the Brattle Street Church formula in 1698 and the Great Awakening or revival between 1730 and 1750 served to show how little the Puritan creed and ordinances were adapted to human nature, and these compromises weakened the whole body, religious and social.

In 1700 Cotton Mather writes: "I see Satan beginning a terrible shake in the churches of New England, and the innovators that have set up a new church in Boston (a *new* one indeed!) have made a day of temptation among us. The men are ignorant, arrogant, obstinate and full of malice and slander, and they fill the land with lies. . . . Wherefore I set apart this day again for prayer in my study, to cry mightily unto God."

The Methodists under Whitefield and Davenport played havoc with the Puritan uniformity.

"Good Lord," said Davenport, about 1750, "I will not mince the matter any longer with Thee, for Thou knowest that I know that most of the ministers of Boston and of the country are unconverted and are leading their people blindfold to hell." He was indicted for slander and acquitted as insane, and no wonder, for he preached a sermon on one occasion nearly twenty-four hours in length.

The Methodist revival collapsed, and apathy was the result, but the Baptists and Methodists and other English sects gained a footing which was never after lost.

The lethargy in England between 1750 and 1775 that came from the deist and infidel philosophy imported from Europe must have had its counterpart in the colony. In spite, however, of all these currents and counter-currents, the religious instruction did not change much in form, and the various sects secured a part of the State tax for the support of their religious houses of worship, and no doubt were able in the localities where they were strong to manage the schools on their own lines and to have the teachers interpret according to their views. The sources or books were the same for all, but the spirit of understanding and interpretation was different.

The corner-stone was the same religious training, but the color, shape and strength of the building varied more and more; in fact, it was the denominational system just developing naturally from the original foundation, while the statute law remained unchanged one *jot* or *tittle*. Thus closed the first period.

SECOND PERIOD—1775 TO 1825.

The second period shows the steady rise of the denominational system, but at the same time the growing decadence of the common school in secular as in religious training, and thus presents some interesting features.

When the vigorous colonies made that great kick against the mother country, some have even ventured to say the kick by right Divine, which is now so often recalled by our Filipino cousins, to justify their own, the question was no longer, are you a Puritan or Baptist or Episcopalian, but are you a patriot or a Tory? Be what

you like in religion, only kick and fight against England. A new bond of unity, another invitation to religious variety.

With this force and even somewhat earlier a far different force was the wave of French infidel philosophy that had far more influence upon the fathers and educators of our Revolutionary period than we are wont to realize or at least acknowledge.

The part that France, noble Catholic France, played in making us a nation is a wonderful page of history. When I fix my eyes upon the great monarchy under King Louis XVI. and Queen Marie Antoinette, after 800 years of vigorous and prosperous life, then bleeding at every pore from internal injuries and on the verge of financial ruin, and I see her allowing herself to be bled once more to give food and protection and confidence to this bouncing, kicking boy of America against the giant power of England, I cannot but admire and praise. But the very force that was disrupting France, infidel philosophy, was making itself felt, feebly at first, but none the less effectively, on our shores. Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, all had come under its spell by personal touch in Paris or by the indirect reflex action of literature. The American mind was changing, and when the educated public mind changes, sooner or later public opinion and then statute law will crystallize that mind.

Did the thought ever come to you that in the great "Declaration of Independence," made in 1776 for the religious eyes of the whole world, there is a clear public recognition of the "Creator of all men," the "Supreme Judge of the world" and of "Divine Providence" as protector and guide of men, while on the other hand in the Constitution of the United States made in 1789 there is not the slightest hint of any such power in the United States or out of it? Thirteen years separated the two documents, and among other things the French secular idea that was about to deluge France with human blood in fraternal strife had made its indelible mark upon the minds of American statesmen.

Religion that had been fundamental in each of the colonies was not even mentioned in the United States Constitution, much less recognized as useful or necessary to national ideals. The first amendment soon tied the hands of Congress by prohibiting the establishment of any religion and any interference with the free exercise thereof.

It was probably the only practical course, as Divine Providence had already split up the colonists into very many sects, and the Catholics, few in numbers, were respected, but not feared.

That same influence was seen more clearly still in the records of the University of the State of New York, which I will only mention,

as outside of our subject, but in reality the French infidel philosophy and a Frenchman by name, "L'Homme-Dien," strangely enough, conceived, developed and brought forth that great institution. The influence was felt all over the country, and Jefferson and Franklin must have drunk many a draught at that unhallowed fountain, as their writings prove, for the mottoes of Franklin show that the electric spark of mind and ether and the golden coin were his chief idols. In Massachusetts it was felt less and later than elsewhere, and the serenity of the Boston Puritan in his stronghold may be realized when we hear John Adams say while standing up in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia: "A change in the solar system might be expected as soon as a change in the ecclesiastical (hence educational) system of Massachusetts."

Yet in forty years from that time the whole system had been shattered, and the change in religious ideas as in education was the chief destroying force. During and after the war schooling was much neglected, and now poverty and taxation made the burden of the school all the harder, hence the minimum only was demanded, and the "grammar" or classical school was weakened or abandoned in many towns, while districts made up of two or more towns were formed to keep such a school. Wealthy people there were, many perhaps laying the foundation of their wealth during the war. These people needed schools to prepare their boys for college and to give their girls an education, for girls had been almost entirely overlooked in the early Puritan régime. All the sects were bold and free when the war was over, and to these three facts must be attributed the rise of the "private school," or academy, as it was called, where a polite education for the girls and a classical training for the boys determined the course of studies. Several were founded by individual wealthty merchants, hence the names of Dummer, Philips, Williston, or from the town in which they were built, as Leicester, Worcester, Groton, etc.

The religion of the founder generally fixed the religion of the academy and determined the choice of teachers, books, etc., but the pupils were not bound to follow the teaching. Hence Quaker, Baptist, various shades of Congregationalists were all freely represented.

Legislatures are always ready to see facts and figures squarely, and the town representatives saw an opportunity to lighten, if not remove, the heavy tax by encouraging the academy.

The two oldest, Dummer and Philips, had already gained renown from the character and scholarship of teachers and pupils, hence other places petitioned for a similar institution, and the Legislature gave an endowment in the shape of a "township in Maine," to be

sold or worked, to three new incorporated academies. The alliance was made between Legislature and private academy, and in rapid succession petitions for similar aid were presented. A committee of the Legislature examined the whole question, reported in favor of encouraging the plan and in 1797 the Legislature formally adopted all the incorporated academies as public State schools, offered similar inducements to all other towns, fixing, of course, the conditions so as to safeguard the interests of all.

From 1797 to 1840 one hundred and twelve acts of incorporation had been given to eighty-eight towns all over the State, though all were not opened. Thus, as nearly all the present colleges of Massachusetts were founded or strengthened by State aid, so the numerous academies that adorned and in many places still adorn Massachusetts, and in which I believe the best men and women of Massachusetts were educated, were started or very materially aided by legislative grants. Thus denominational education made great strides forward, and the old "grammar schools" founded in 1647 rapidly disappeared or became very insignificant.

Another influence began to show strength very soon after the war closed, and it is the primary factor at this very hour, namely, Unitarianism.

It is not our task to trace here its genesis, but meeting it as a fact and factor show how it affected the "religious training in the school." The old Puritan believed that Christ Jesus was God, Second Person of the Blessed Trinity and made man to redeem the world from sin, and all Catholics and all true Christians must ever believe the same unchanging doctrine.

Deism, rampant in France and England after 1750, was inconsistent with that doctrine, and as many did not wish to forsake Christ and Christianity, they figured out their scheme, in part going back to an old heresy of the fourth century, Arianism, that Christ was not God, but was somebody between God and man, a supernatural or spiritual man, the ideal excellence of manhood, or even simply a man developed to the noblest manly ideals, surpassing all others, as Plato, Socrates, etc., etc. Hence they denied the Trinity, forsook or were driven out by the Trinitarians and called themselves Unitarians, as professing the Unity of God.

Calvinism and predestinarianism went to pieces during the eighteenth century, and though the revivals of Whitefield and Jonathan Edwards galvanized it into life for a few years, the life was gone, and the old adherents and ministers of the Congregational churches were slowly but surely being inoculated with the Unitarian virus. It weakened and divided one congregation after another and then little by little animated a large enough body to form a separate

congregation, thus completely breaking up the old Puritan and Congregational Commonwealth, which had maintained all its power even in presence of the other sects. This struck at the very vitals of the whole Puritan doctrine, polity and practice, and the ecclesiastical system was changed, while the solar system still rolls on in the starry dome above, as also on our earth.

Now as the Unitarians gained influence in church and school with corresponding progress and they made inroads on Baptist, Quaker, Episcopalian and Methodist, the faithful of each congregation were all the more anxious to encourage and strengthen the denominational academy, hence another sure germ of decadence was eating into the heart of the old common school, and from the grammar school was sure to quickly, if quietly, advance into the primary school on the one hand an the college on the other. This is really what happened and before the year 1830 Harvard College was practically in control of the Unitarians, as it is to-day.

One very striking fact will vividly illustrate the whole movement. The Catholics of New England in 1790 were an obscure and scattered band of French, Spanish, Portuguese and Irish emigrants all along the coast from Eastport to New York, and a good sized group in Boston. Pitied by all in their poverty and supposed superstition, scorned by the real Puritan, protected and respected by the Unitarians for general and special reasons not to be even mentioned here, feared by no one. French priest, Frs. Matignon and Cheverus, occasionally an Irish monk like Fr. Lariscy, or strange contrast, a Unitarian converted and ordained, Fr. Thayer, would gather them, French and Irish people together and finally Bishop Cheverus secured a Cathedral. He established the Ursuline nuns in Boston to found a school in 1820. These good nuns had been accustomed to academy life, and, leaving Boston, opened the Mount St. Benedict Convent and Academy, in 1826, in Charlestown. The teaching must have been very fascinating, for a large number of pupils came. The religious instruction was Catholic; yet that was no barrier, and we might draw many beautiful lessons and hopes from this one fact which now concerns us, that, when the convent was destroyed on that unhallowed night of August 11, 1834, there were more Protestant pupils than Catholics in that Catholic Ursuline convent. (Twelve Catholic pupils out of about seventy.)

In the year 1817 there were in the public common schools of Boston 2,365 pupils and in the private denominational schools 4,132 pupils.

The private denominational school was the great social, aristocratic, intellectual, popular and religious factor in Massachusetts. It was the logical and reasonable outgrowth from the seeds sown

and nourished by the founders, suiting the variety and respecting, by liberty and equality, religious convictions, without minimizing them. The public common school was in a stage of serious decadence that must surely, before many years, mean its passing away. It had become not a seminary of education, but as the Scotchmen had said of a school in another country, "a cemetery for education." Its death-knell had sounded when a young man appeared on the scene, Horace Mann by name, with whom our third period or chapter opens.

THIRD PERIOD—1825 TO 1900.

There is a proverb: "The child is father to the man," and there is another, so oft quoted: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it."

Both proverbs were ejaculatory mottoes for Horace Mann, and he is the best illustration of how they are and are not true, for the difficulty is always to know in just what way he should go, and Horace Mann departed considerably from the way in which he was trained up, or perhaps he would say chained up. He grew to manhood during the first quarter of the nineteenth century while Unitarianism was disrupting all the Protestant churches and the old "public school" was literally going to the dogs or to the Devil, according to its friends and enemies.

He was born at Franklin, Massachusetts, in 1796, of a father who was a farmer and strict Calvinist and who died when the boy was 13 years of age: of a mother, sweet, gentle soul, who, with her blood, gave many of the beautiful traits for which he is justly noted and merits unstinted praise. His pastor was a hyper or intense Calvinist, strict predestinarian. Between the father and the pastor Horace learned to call the Creator of the world "cruel," and, being of a very sensitive, imaginative nature, probably also a playful boy, he became very morose, "looking for a personal Devil behind every hedge and tree to carry him off."

Of his own traits he has said: "I never was drunk (except with joy and sadness); I never swore; I never used 'the vile weed' in any form," which, according to him, was the climax of virtue; "I never was a slave to any bad habit;" and lastly, when his sister manifested apprehension, anxiety, alarm at his condition of mind losing the Christian faith, he wrote these telling words: "I felt, indeed, that it was a great and irreparable misfortune that I had not been taught the existence of a God worthy of being loved." Such was the action and reaction of the Calvinistic teaching of his youth.

He had the ordinary farmer boy schooling, eight or ten weeks a year, under what he called "good people," but "poor teachers,"

and, finally, at the age of 20, entered the sophomore class at Brown University in Providence. Hard study under a tutor to prepare and unwearied application that brought the highest honors to him at Brown, undermined his health and shattered his nerves, never afterwards steady, and perhaps this accounts for his erratic or rather imaginative judgment to the end of his life. At Brown, where Unitarianism was then unknown, a revival of religion did not take hold of Horace, but his thorough knowledge of Greek and Roman classics, then and there gained as pupil and later as tutor, neutralized, yes, completely drowned the old Calvinistic doctrines, and made him a respectable Deist, which he was also to the end of his life, though nominally a Boston Unitarian and later simply a Christian.

Were I inclined to psychological inferences, I could trace some of the fruits of his later life to the seeds sown in mind, heart and soul during the educational periods, but that is not my present aim, and I only mention it to show how important it is to sow the right seeds in the fertile youthful natures.

He studied law, and soon entered the Massachusetts Legislature, where a bill was introduced to divide among various Protestant sects the money, called the religious tax, or at least set apart for religious purposes, and perhaps the school and academy grants were involved. This appropriation had been made from the very first Massachusetts General Court, and probably some of the newer churches asked to share in it, but it was the beginning of the end.

Horace Mann made his first speech on religious liberty and against such a bill, defeated it and thus took by storm the fortress that had stood for nearly two hundred years, and by which alone Calvinism or Puritanism could stand.

In the same year, 1827, he secured a bill "making it unlawful to use the common school or to teach anything in the school in order to proselyte the children to a belief in any particular sect."

Religious liberty was his first principle or shibboleth, and it served to destroy by law what had been law and practice from the beginning. He saw very clearly, however, that a law was of little avail unless the public mind believed in it and supported it, hence unless the people were educated in the right principles, and his must be right, the laws would be of no avail. Education then became his watchword, his star, his sun; I, for one, am convinced, his God.

Education and his education would be the preventive of all future human ills and a panacea for all the actual social diseases. Let me quote a typical passage:

> Without undervaluing any other human agency, it may be safely affirmed

that the common school, *improved* and *energized* as it can easily be, may become the most effective and benignant of *all* the forces of civilization, a reformatory and elevating influence. The materials upon which it operates are so pliant and ductile as to be susceptible of assuming a greater variety of forms than any other earthly work of the Creator. The inflexibility and ruggedness of the oak, when compared with the lithe sapling or tender germ, are but feeble emblems to typify the docility of childhood when contrasted with the obduracy and intractableness of man. In its infancy in our State (this was said in 1848), with a system so imperfect and administration so feeble, education has proved what it can do by glorious experiments. When its faculties shall be fully developed, when it shall be trained to wield its mighty energies for the protection of society against the giant vices now invading and tormenting it, against intemperance, avarice, war, slavery, bigotry, the woes of want and the wickedness of waste, then there shall not be a height to which these enemies of the race can escape which it will not scale, nor a Titan among them all whom it will not slay.

Original sin, the seven deadly sins, the sins crying to heaven for vengeance and a few other fashionable sins, and the Puritan knew well how widespread and deep they were in spite of religion and education, all these would vanish like the clouds dispersing rapidly when once opened by the giant sun. I wish that he were alive to-day, after fifty years of its development, and pass judgment on the angelic purity and unselfish principles of modern American life.

We must remember distinctly that the Deist and Unitarian agree in nearly all points, and their great aim was to break down all the Divine and human barriers of blood, nation and religion by substituting a new religion, aye, even a Biblical religion, to be common to all, and the common school was to be incubator of that religion. First Massachusetts had the old and positive Christian religion, distorted indeed, but in many points exact and true, as the spirit of its education. Then the same spirit, but in varied forms to suit the variety of people. Now it was to be a uniform spirit once more, religious even, but unsectarian, subterfuge for that other word they dared not use—Unitarian.

At the start, in 1825, the Catholics were so few in Boston or Massachusetts that they could be disregarded in the reckoning of forces. The State Board of Education was soon formed to champion the new "State worship." Horace Mann was its first secretary, and Harvard College became then, as it is to this day, the fountain source of its ideas and of its plans.

Horace Mann gave up literature, law and politics—and he would have made his mark in any one of them—started to rouse public opinion in favor of the "new public school" and to organize political forces in its favor. He went up and down the State talking on education in every possible phase, physical, moral, intellectual, religious; on school houses, schoolmasters, methods of teaching, courses of study, books, apparatus and every conceivable iota of educational value; called upon the people to desert the private school, as opposed to democracy and liberty, and to support the common school. This supposed danger or mythical bugbear of

developing classes and destroying democracy by education in private schools under State control was foreshadowed as early as 1795 by Governor Sam Adams. It was eloquently and exhaustively portrayed by a Mr. Carter, of Lancaster, Mass., who may be styled the advance crier of Horace Mann, but when the Board of Education was established in 1837 and Mann was made its first secretary, it was preached everywhere.

No one can read the account of his journeyings over the State and refuse to him the title of apologist, or victim, or some might say martyr of the "Non-sectarian Common School." Remember well that his plan called for religious instruction and devotion, but it was to be simply of the "Unitarian type," "nebulous and fragmentary," "formless and void" that suits the Non-Conformist of England and his cousin in New England, but nobody else.

He was aggressive, abusive, eloquent, some would say violent in speech and manner; his fluency of speech, with a wonderfully fertile imagination and a style of language which he acquired not by studying the rules of English grammar, but by analyzing and teaching Latin and Greek classics, made him all the more effective and interesting against enemies.

His descriptions of the slow, uncouth, unkempt, untaught, unteachable and unteaching schoolmasters is now an interesting historic page that does not look well on the fair and white records of Massachusetts. The schoolmasters, of course, defended their ways and means and retaliated, but had no champion able to cope with Horatius of Massachusetts. Mann hated the Orthodox or Calvinistic creed of his father and all cognate dogmatic forms that have any meaning, and he never cloaked his hope and aim of breaking down such degrading restraints upon human folly or liberty, as he would say. Hence the ministers especially attacked him and boldly maintained that the new reform was an attempt to take religious instruction out of the schools, eventually to secularize them, thus to destroy the very object for which they had been established, to remove the corner-stone from the foundation, to tear down the time-honored inscription over the doorway.

They abused him as a vandal and an iconoclast, opposed every measure that he advocated and united to thwart him even when the law was against them. The sequel will show, to-day more than ever shows, that the above fears and claims were well grounded.

After he had been secretary of the State Board of Education for five years, fighting, as he said, with lions and leopards, he made a trip to Europe in 1843 to examine the school systems in vogue. Scotland, England, Belgium, Germany were the chief places, with just a peep into France. On his return he published a full account

of his observations, and almost every line was a thrust at the schoolmasters of Massachusetts and a sword into the heart of the ministers, who now openly asserted that he wished to Prussianize and paganize Massachusetts.

In spite of all Mann's efforts, the religious instruction was maintained on denominational lines, and ten years after the law forbade it Horace found clear denominational teaching when he visited the schools.

(In 1848 he caught the political fever, aspired to and won a seat in Congress, to fight rum and slavery and all other iniquities. Four years of fighting at Washington with no visible sign of success, or even progress, and he was on the same day, September 15, 1852, nominated for Governor of Massachusetts and elected as president of Antioch College in Ohio. He accepted the latter, and strove to carry out his educational views in a coeducational institution. Trials, sorrows, scandals financial for the college and moral for the pupils followed in his pathway, and the college was bankrupt, almost ruined. It got a fresh start, and, wonder of wonders, Horace was obliged to subscribe to a formula of Christian faith against his wishes and protests, if he wished to remain at the head. Sickness that, in fact, had been his constant companion from his student days at Brown now rapidly undermined his constitution, and he died at the college in August, 1859, a life beautiful in one aspect, but from another point the victim of "private judgment in moral and religious matters" of imagination where judgment should guide, of false educational germs in his youth, of impossible ambition in his manhood and of well nigh general disappointment at Massachusetts, Congress, America and the world, which, as he said, "would be beautiful if it only had *fit* inhabitants."

When he closed his career in the State Board of Education in Massachusetts the ministers certainly believed that they would triumph, and in both press and pulpit the cry was: "We shall never abandon the religious instruction in the schools; rather let the whole public school system perish and let each denomination provide and pay for the education, secular and religious, of its children, or all be compensated by the State."

Amid these discussions and threats there came a new—what shall I call it?—cloud on the horizon, or a bright constellation in the firmament of Massachusetts.

Lest I should be considered too bold in speech, I will quote exactly the words of one who, in Boston and Massachusetts at this very day, is well known and understood, Mr. George Martin, a supervisor in the schools of Boston: "While this discussion was going on a new *danger* appeared, in the presence of which the opposing parties ceased their wordy conflict, and, combining their forces *against the common enemy*, solidified public opinion in support of the non-sectarian public school."

Who was the common enemy? No other than the Irish Catholics, who came in wave upon wave into Boston harbor about 1848, and have been coming since almost with every tide.

The "common enemy!" Not a very polite or friendly title, yet there it is in cold type, and, though long since and happily enlightened, no word better expressed the public mind of Boston at that

hour. The Irish had been coming in small numbers for nearly fifty years, and I have often wondered why, in the dismal years of famine in the Green Isle of the Ocean, so many of the people turned to Boston. There were many economic reasons and, a short time ago, I discovered that, in 1847, the Mayor of Boston, Hon. Josiah Quincy, collected and sent to Ireland in money or provisions the sum of $150,000. Is it any wonder then that gratitude and love and a longing to see that wonderful place should have filled the hearts of the Irish multitude? To-day one of the poor Irish emigrant boys is Mayor of Boston.

However much friendship there was for them in Ireland, they were not welcome to the shores of Pilgrim and Puritan. The why and wherefore it is not our duty or right to discuss here, yet some allusion is necessary, and it is an important part of the story.

Education for himself and a generous share to all other races was a most striking trait, even instinct, of the Celt as far back as the sixth and eighth centuries, and the long privation of it from Cromwell, the tyrant, to O'Connell, the liberator, only made the hunger more acute.

How well then the common school, non-sectarian, would suit the new comers, Irish and Catholic! Ah! no, said the Puritan descendant, that mingling of the races would not do for us or our children! Ah! no, said the Irish Catholic; at home we scorned an education that meant the sacrifice of our faith; we have not come here to be disloyal to God and our Church, for any education, even the best in the world. The Bible, the Protestant Bible, is in your schools; that we will not have. Divide therefore the money as you have during so many years past, to support the schools; let us have the religious education that each believes the best, and then we will live in peace and unity as American citizens, faithful to God and faithful to country. Otherwise we will have and support our own schools, at whatever cost.

All these ideas and demands were put into formal propositions, and actually were put into operation in Massachusetts. In the city of Lowell, after several ineffectual attempts to get the Irish children into what were called "Yankee schools with Yankee teachers and Yankee text-books," the School Board authorized separate Catholic schools with Catholic teachers and all text-books subject to the approval of the pastor, and all expense, save the rent of the rooms, paid by the city treasury.

That was in 1835, before the great invasion of '48 and '49. When, however, the great influx came, a different spirit came over the Bostonians and Massachusetts men, as if some epidemic or barbarian horde was threatening ruin to the body and soul of the State.

How far Horace Mann, his lieutenants and enemies were promotors in this movement it is very hard to say. A contemporary and acquaintance of Mr. Mann, and still living, a convert to the Catholic faith, puts it on record that the system of non-sectarian schools was formulated in Massachusetts for the very purpose of making the children of the foreigners lose their Catholic religion as well as gain American patriotic and civic virtue, by education and liberty.

There is no doubt, either, that many of the priests who labored in Massachusetts from 1840 to 1860 have left this point clear, that the non-sectarian common schools were organized to break down the barrier of the Catholic faith in the children of the emigrants, while the efforts to build schools during that period, when the Catholic could scarcely exist, would seem to convey the same idea.

One fact, above all, is sure in my mind beyond even a suspicion of doubt, namely, that Horace Mann came back from Europe in 1843 a more avowed enemy and hater of all dogmatic belief and respecting the Catholic Church less than before. Justice prompts some strong words of condemnation in speaking of him, and duty towards the Church and Catholic truth urges a Catholic priest to show up the man who has maligned that truth and that Church. I judge him not from hearsay nor from any outside evidence, but out of his own mouth, his letters, his reports.

In his lecture on the "Historical View of Education," given in 1840, he gives his first appreciation of what the Church accomplished during the Middle Ages for education:

> Shortly after the commencement of the Christian era all idea of general popular education and almost all correct notions concerning education itself died out of the minds of men. A gloomy and terrible period succeeded, which lasted a thousand years—a sixth part of the past duration of the race of men! Approaching this period from the side of antiquity or going back to view it from our own age, we come, as it were, to the borders of a great Gulf of Despair. Gazing down from the brink of this remorseless abyss, we behold a spectacle resembling rather the maddest orgies of demons than any deeds of men. Oppression usurped the civil throne. Persecution seized upon the holy altar. Rulers demanded the unconditional submission of body and soul and sent forth ministers of fire and sword to destroy what they could not enslave. Innocence changed places with guilt and bore all its penalties. Even remorse seems to have died from out the souls of men. As high as the halls of the regal castle rose into the air, so deep beneath were excavated the dungeons of the victim, into which hope never came. By the sde of the magnificent cathedral was built the Inquisition, and all those who would not enter the former and bow the soul in homage to men were doomed by the latter to have the body broken or burned. All that power, wealth, arts, civilization had conferred upon the old world—even new-born, divine Christianity itself—were converted into instruments *of physical bondage and spiritual degradation.* These centuries have been falsely called the Dark Ages; they were not dark; they glare out more conspicuously than any other ages of the world; but, alas! they glare with infernal fires. What could education do in such an age? Nothing! Nothing! Its voice was hushed; its animation was suspended.

Such a display of ignorance, imagination or spleen merits contempt, ridicule or pity according as one reads with the eye of

charity or otherwise, for the most superficial acquaintance with English history and the names of Theodore, Bede, Alfred, Alcuin, Dunstan, Langton, Wolsey, More, not to mention Ireland, France, Germany and Italy, with their free schools and universities, would make any educated man blush to write such nonsense.

It prepares the way for more direct attack. In his report for 1843, p. 365 (Cambridge edition of 1867), after his return from Europe, he exalts Prussia, Holland and Scotland and reserves his sneers for France, Belgium and Austria: "Austria, impenetrable Austria, over which the black horizon of despotism shuts down like a cover, excluding as far as possible all light, intelligence and knowledge; Austria, true to the base and cowardly instincts of ignorance and bigotry, disallows the establishment of a free Normal School," etc.

Yet, strangely enough, Austria had a complete public school system before Prussia, and the latter country, as Horace Mann himself admitted in private conversation, adopted the methods and studies of the Catholic Austrian system. Then, too, in Massachusetts at that very time the establishment of Normal Schools was violently denounced and opposed.

Now, no one will be surprised at the following appreciations, taken from his "Life by his wife," second edition, Boston, 1865:

(*a*) P. 207. In Saxony:

I was introduced to a Catholic priest, the keeper of the King's conscience. I found him a most delightful man; full of generosity; a noble figure, fine head, the most charming expression of countenance. . . . If such a man can grow up under the influences of Catholicism, what would he be under a nobler dispensation?

(*b*) P. 211:

In Coblentz (on the Rhine) I heard a Catholic priest give a religious lesson to the children. A part of it consisted of an explanation of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and particularly of transubstantiation. He said: if Christ could turn water into wine (as He did at Cana), then why not turn wine into blood and bread into flesh? and I am sure I could not tell him why one was not as easy as the other. The children were obliged to sit for an hour, with their hands placed together in front, *and hear this nonsense.* They seemed uneasy and miserable enough. I went into the church, heard the mummeries, saw the genuflections and the sprinkling with holy water. The quantity of water did not seem to be material . . . and I am inclined to believe that such a homœopathic dose answered the same purpose as taking an entire bath.

(*c*) P. 217: After mentioning almost with regret that "a national system of public schools had just been decreed, with secular instruction under civil authority, moral and religious instruction under ecclesiastical authority and that religion and morals are proclaimed inseparable in the schools," he states the fact "that Belgium had schools for deaf, dumb and blind;" that he had witnessed "a great festival in Brussels in honor of the Queen of England; that

there was a vast crowd, beautiful decorations, a well behaved people and no disorder." Then he adds:

> Here I saw many Catholics worshiping in the churches; *everything* which I have seen of them, *here and elsewhere*, impresses me *more and more deeply* with the baneful influence of the Catholic religion upon the human mind; and not upon the mind only, but even upon the body. The votaries are not *degraded* only, but *distorted;* not *only debased*, but *deformed.*

(*d*) In France he did not trouble himself to visit schools, which were in every respect equal to the best in Europe, and he took good care to say nothing in his reports about the magnificent struggle for liberty of education and of religion then going on, but in several places makes vanity and show the chief traits of the French nation and finally in one of his letters, written in 1853, quoted in his "Life," p. 446, says:

> What do you think of France? Frivolity, sensuality and the Catholic religion—what will they not do for the debasement of mankind?

Such are the thoughts, words and judgments of the Mann that is rightly called the Father of the Non-Sectarian Public School System of Massachusetts.

Was all this from a lack of knowledge? Had he acquired too great fluency of speech in the use of harsh epithets, like unconscious swearing from bad habit? Perhaps it was an old Calvinistic germ in his blood. Then, too, he, like certain living educators and sociological leaders of present day Boston, may have thought himself the incarnation of wisdom, wiser than Christ Himself, more aged and infallible than all churches.

Was it from the rage of the conceited reformer, who has removed all the mole hills in his path, and then sees a real mountain of rock, whose summit goes up into the clouds and whose base is wide and deep beyond human vision?

I know not; it may have been something of all four, but for a man who posed as liberal, enlightened, far-seeing and knowing all things, as also the personal embodiment of all the excellencies of the ideal teacher of mankind, I will simply call him a paradox, harmless title, forbear to return abuse for abuse, and, mindful of the Church and her supreme dignity and of the priesthood in its exalted worth, say what the great French nobleman, Montalembert, once said to slanderers in a similar matter:

"The Catholic Church, during her long career of nineteen centuries, has always had vengeance and scored a victory over all her enemies. She had vengeance by praying for them. She scored a victory by outliving them."

In any case the anti-Catholic spirit rose high and clear and strong, became crystallized into a political party, popularly called the Know-Nothing party, and it chiefly centred around the question of religiou instruction in the schools. In Massachusetts the records

of the years 1853, 1854 and 1855 are stained with Governor's inaugurals, press and pulpit invectives and legislative statute, all against the Catholics and Catholic schools.

A constitutional amendment was proposed in 1854 and passed again in 1855 and ratified on May 21, 1855, by the voters of Massachusetts: "All moneys thus raised by taxation in towns, or appropriated by the State shall never be appropriated to any religious sect for the maintenance exclusively of its own schools."

The Catholics demanded, if they must use the common schools, the exclusion of the Bible in the English or King James version, as a Protestant book in origin and doctrine and purpose and spirit. Not only was this refused, but the daily reading of the English Bible, which had been voluntary, though universal from the earliest Puritan days, was made compulsory. The lines were now fixed and the statute law and constitutional limits seemed to bar all hope of a return to the old system that had built up generations of loyal citizens and strong religious characters in Massachusetts. The Lowell system, rightly developed, improved and applied, would have met all reasonable wants, and the sturdy control of education by the people would have been blessed and supported by the maternal hands of the churches. Had the Protestant churches shown tolerance and given reasonable equality to the growing Catholic Church, the Christian denominational schools would now be established all over this country.

Instead of this, a bad spirit was aroused, could not easily be quieted, and quarrels were the natural outcome. There were no doubt many, but one in particular, in the city of Boston, almost caused a riot. It was in 1859. A young boy, Thomas Whall by name, had been told by his father and pastor that he was not to read the Protestant Bible nor the Protestant version of the Ten Commandments, which must have been in vogue, if not the rule. A lady teacher insisted, and the master discharged the boy for disobedience. He returned with the same instructions from his father, and refusing again, was cruelly scourged by the master. Then he and 400 boys were expelled from the Eliot School.

Whall's father entered suit against the city of Boston, and the boy's case was argued by the celebrated lawyers, Caleb Cushing, Fletcher Webster and Wilder Dwight. The indignation of Catholics and the more respectable Protestants was very great, but the case was decided in favor of the city against the boy, as all cases in those days when the Know-Nothing spirit was rampant and strong in Legislature, court and jury. It served, however, a double purpose, the gradual changing of the law or regulation on the Bible reading and it gave a very special impetus to the Catholic school

movement, as out of it was started the Boys' Catholic School at St. Mary's Church, North End, Boston, the first after the school in Holy Cross Cathedral, Franklin street.

The 400 boys, the gallant 400 as they were called, refused to go back to the public school, and the Jesuit Fathers opened the parish school, from which the present Boston College later took its origin.

The Civil War soon came to show how ill founded were the fears and prophecies of the "first men in Massachusetts," and the ignorance, or malice, or selfishness that conceived and brought forth the legislation of 1855 were to behold a loyalty, a courage, a heroism born of Irish blood and Catholic faith that ought to have brought the blush of shame and repentance to the cheeks of the legislators who voted those laws.

During and after the war attempts were again made to gain the good will and support of the State for religious schools, but to no purpose. The statute law was, however, modified in 1862 and again in 1880, so that "Bible reading is required, but without written note or oral comment; a pupil is exempt from taking any part in such exercises if his parent or guardian so wishes; any version is allowed, and no committee may purchase or order to be used in any public school books calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians."

Thus was accomplished for the non-sectarian school system of Massachusetts, directly or indirectly, by the invasion and rapid demands of the Irish Catholics what Horace Mann strove, during twenty years, to effect by argument and invective. Aye, more, for the same statutes were also the germs of the very thing that he abhorred and abjured, and that the Orthodox ministers feared and prophesied, for the words "without written note or oral comment" and the exclusion of every book even calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians, the *Unitarians* included, removed the last vestige of any positive religious instruction of any kind on the part of the teacher, began the secularization of the school, making them non-sectarian and also non-religious, thus completing the transformation in Massachusetts: first strongly and directly religious instruction; then religious through denominational instruction; then Unitarian nebulosity; finally no religious instruction of any kind.

Let me quote again Horace Mann. He and the whole Board had been viciously attacked as robbing the schools of religious instruction. In his last report, of 1848, he undertakes to defend himself, and thus puts himself on record. After some very beautiful though vague essays on moral and religious education, he says:

> Moral education is a primal necessity of social existence. Practical morals

is a blessedness never to be attained without religion, and no community will ever be religious without religious education. These are eternal and immutable truths.

A system of schools from which all religious instruction should be excluded might properly be called un-Christian or rather non-Christian, in the same sense in which it could be called non-Jewish and non-Mohammedan, that is, having no connection with either. I do not suppose a man can be found in Massachusetts who would declare such a system to be his first choice.

Such are his words, yet he was hardly cold in the grave when the Legislature of Massachusetts practically accomplished that very thing, and as the logical outcome of all his efforts.

The same result has been gradually but constantly going on, though indirectly, by the development of course of studies, text-books and by the personality of the teachers and pupils. The course of studies in secular branches has been enlarged and enriched by physiology, natural history, science, hygiene, temperance, while the religious exercises have remained at a standstill, have been made a mere formality, have been minimized or in many places entirely neglected. In a town of Massachusetts last year a new teacher in a public school tested her class of twenty-seven pupils on the recitation of the Lord's Prayer, and only ten of the twenty-seven had ever heard of it.

If you have a vessel containing half wine and half water, and you keep on pouring water without increasing the wine, it will not take long to utterly drown the wine, to take away its color, taste and vigor, and so it has been, the wine representing religion, the water secular knowledge, in the common schools of Massachusetts.

The same is true of text-books. When the Bible was the reading book and the spelling book and the grammar treasury, its spirit was gradually and constantly absorbed, while its letter was taught and remembered. That has all vanished, and the text-books that now flood our public schools, however excellent in their own special subjects, hardly mention the name of God, would seem to exclude the name of Christ, the Founder of Christianity, and in history as in geography or reading will hardly impress upon the mind of either teacher or pupil that this universe was created by God or is governed by Divine Providence or owes anything to the Christian religion above all others.

I have examined reading and geography and grammar books in numbers, and I would conclude that the authors had one sure aim among other obscure purposes, namely, to take care of never suggesting a thought about positive definite Christian truth of any kind. Yet the text-books are or ought to be for the child what literature is to a people, its teacher, its consolation, its inspiration.

I know that all this is said to be a practical necessity owing to the different races and religion among the teachers and pupils, but

it is leading inevitably and with rapidity to the absolute exclusion of all religious thought and Christian thought by a process of gradual elimination, hence the State, while not favoring any religion and protecting all, is really and surely fostering in the minds of the children that worst of systems, "absence of all religion." That eventually becomes the "worthlessness of all religion." That insidious and delusive sort of thing called non-sectarian religion means in its last stages no religion at all, and Massachusetts, in so far as it was possible for her to do it, has swung clear away to the other end of the arc from the law of 1642, when education was ordered to teach the children of all future generations the "principles of religion" first, last and always.

There are, indeed, some few rays of light and one clearly written fact that promise a return to a wiser and juster course in this all important matter. First of all, thoughtful and educated men show a restlessness and assert that something is wrong in our country on the side of ideals, civic, moral, social, political and literary, whatever satisfaction may come from commercial prosperity and warlike prestige. I do not mean the restlessness of enthusiasts or Utopian dreamers, like Horace Mann, who fail to recognize that in the child-man born to-day a new world and a human nature prone to evil is born, but the practical men in touch with life. They will not agree upon just what the something wrong is, though nearly all say lack of moral training, but that restlessness, like in the sinner's breast, makes them look more closely into fundamental sources of the nation's health.

Secondly, direct charge against public schools as responsible for the shortcomings of the nation. President Eliot said not long ago: "It is indisputable that we have experienced a profound disappointment in the results thus far obtained from a widely diffused popular education." Then he enumerates drunkenness, gambling, bad government from universal suffrage, robbery and murder, reading of the daily paper, demoralizing theatres, credulity of men and women in patent medicines, labor strikes, anarchy and rioting, spoils system, stunted moral and mental growth of individuals, etc. It is almost the identical wail of Horace Mann sixty years ago, only these vices were all to vanish under the giant sun of the common school. What is President Eliot's remedy? More money and more of the same teaching. With all due respect I would answer: let him bring back what the seal of Harvard College calls for, "Truth for Christ and the Church," and give out less of what one has recently been called: Eliot dicta and Eliotism.

Some do not perhaps realize that President Eliot is the sponsor by statute law for the moral education of the State of Massachusetts.

The statute of 1789 imposes the obligation of moral instruction upon all educators of youth, but upon the president of Harvard College the supreme responsibility for the moral education of the youth makes him the leader of them all down to the obscurest teacher of the lowliest children in the humblest school.

Now all the other States, including the great State of Pennsylvania, have taken their common school system from Massachusetts, hence who is surprised that he is the educational dictator of the present hour, makes a senior out of a sophmore by a stroke of his pen, determines what is culture and what is science and even what is religion; aye, more, recommends appointments by which he may regulate the school systems of the Philippines, of Cuba, Hawaii and Guam? God save the Commonwealth and the nation by a return to Christian education and morality!

Another ray of light comes from the attempt to get the Bible back into its former place in the schools, not now as a religious book or revealed doctrine or inspired word, but as a literature, Hebrew and Greek. That indirect way was suggested at an important meeting of educators, and has been sung and preached everywhere. I was present last October at a meeting of the New England Superintendents in Boston, and Dr. Harris, of Amherst, explained why and how the Bible could be introduced as literature. It was interesting and ingenious, but during the discussion one clear-headed gentleman arose and said: "Let us be honest with ourselves and say that we want to get the religion of the Bible back into the schools." On the other hand, the merest reading of the Bible in the schools has been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of three or four States.

Again, a great many people are openly demanding more religious instruction in the schools and are ready to compromise. President Schurmann, of Cornell University, said in Boston last winter: "It is time for all honest Americans to recognize that there is really no moral education in our public schools, and of course no spiritual or religious instruction."

Quotations of a similar import are now so common and widespread that only the mention of the fact seems necessary.

Lastly, there is the big ray of light from the Anglo-Saxon Mother, that after thirty years of an experiment with undenominational religious instruction, "nebulous and fragmentary, formless and void," she has abolished the nameless thing and instead of juggling with words has established denominational schools for all who desire them, secular schools for the pupils of parents who prefer that kind, and has put all pupils on an equality before the law by paying for the secular education of all on the same basis.

Old England has thus set a shining example to her daughter, New England, but whenever one mentions that in Massachusetts or elsewhere, the editors and educators and politicians are deaf or turn their ears to sounds of revelry.

This restlessness, these protests and demands, these quack remedies and homœopathic doses to cure a sure and acute evil ought to give hope and courage. The respected president of Brown University, speaking in Boston last winter, stated the protest in a very clear and interesting lecture. In seeking a way to meet the protest he thought that fifteen of the most prominent educators, including President Eliot, Edward Everett Hale, Felix Adler and Archbishop Ireland, with others, Protestant, Catholic, Jew, agnostic, socialist and nondescript, might meet in conference and make out a "Text-Book of Moral Teaching" acceptable to all, suitable to the schools of the whole country, and thus bring on the millenium. Utopian dream of a bright, refined and affable mind!

It is clear, therefore, that the question has not been settled right, and our Declaration of Independence warrants us to cry out that no popular question is settled at all until it is settled right.

In presence of all these protests, demands and remedies, there is a fact, standing out as clearly as Bunker Hill Monument, and the silent witness of an idea as well known as the spirit that built up that granite shaft. The fact is a Catholic school system, 71,000 pupils with 1,300 teachers in forty cities and towns in about 100 parish districts, and doing the educational work of the State. It will save to the treasuries of the State, cities and towns this year about $2,500,000, for, while not costing that sum to the Catholic people, it could not be given by the State for a lesser amount. What is the idea and spirit that gave rise and development and permanency to such a fact? Not disloyalty to the State idea. No more loyal and devoted pupils can be found. Not a want of patriotism. Nowhere are the true lessons of the starry banner inculcated with more constancy. Not because the secular education of the common schools is insufficient. The identical secular training is given, unless impossible conditions of language or place raise a temporary barrier. But because in the common schools the State authorities have refused to give or to allow the moral and religious training that the parents of these 71,000 children rightfully and consistently demand. Because the education of the common school is not a complete education, since it ignores the most important part of all education, namely, of the soul. Because the idea of education in the common school does not harmonize with the unchanging and unchangeable Christian idea of education. What is that idea? The cultivation of the child for life's destiny and life's

work. *The child.* Not some paper doll or waxen plastic model, nor indeed the beautifully imagined darling flower or ethereal sort of creature that we hear so much about in later days, but the child of flesh and blood, whose birth and life are so well pictured in the poet's line: "When a man child is born, a world is born, a world of passion, sorrow, sin and suffering as well as a world beautiful and fair to the eye of God, its Creator, as to the parents that gave it being. When a woman child is born, 'tis again the same world with perhaps some other deep and mysterious fountain of good and evil."

This child cannot be divided and separated into physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual parts, except by a purely mental or metaphysical process that has no corresponding reality, but everything that happens to the child, from its first breath, is cultivating or educating the child in all four aspects. One part cannot be given to the parent, another to the street, a third to the school, a fourth to the Church, but the whole child is cultivated by each one of these agencies, and the least lack of harmony between them in purpose or means has its effect upon the whole child.

Cultivation. That word seems to be the best of all, for it is natural; it is scientific; it expresses well the child's innate powers and the active influence of educational agents or factors; it is also in harmony with the most ancient and modern concepts of the germ expanding into a blade of grass, a tiny flower or a sturdy oak in the spiritual as in the material world.

For life's destiny. Once admit the Divine creation and Divine destiny the common non-religious school is bad, for as Ruskin once said: "It does not tell the child whence it came, whither it is going and how to get there." The whole view of education, of the value of one or other factor and method in education depends in a large measure upon one's concept of life's destiny. For the Christian there can be but one, expressed in those words of the Divine teacher: "I am the way, the truth, the life. I am the Light of the world. You are the children of your Father who is in heaven, hence sons of God. *For life's work.* Yes, the school must teach the child the dignity of work, cultivate, for work, all the powers of senses, mind, will and soul, and let it know that every look of the eye, every act of the will, every pulsation of the heart and every ambition of the soul either is in harmony with that destiny of life or draws the child farther away from it.

Such is the idea and spirit that explain and justify the fact. We plead for a school in which the atmosphere will be Christian; we plead for a school in which the teacher will be Christian and not neutralize, much less destroy, the influence of home and Church;

we plead for a school where the books will be Christian in tone, spirit and substance; we plead for a school in which the Bible, as a book of revealed religion and the inspired Word of God to mankind, may be read with note and comment and interest and instruction by one who believes in it as such.

We plead for a school where the emblems of patriotism and the heroes of our common country in statue or picture may be side by side with the emblems of Calvary, with the heroes of mercy, of charity, of sacrifice out of love for God and their fellow-men.

We plead for a school where the child will find the same instruction as in the good home or in the Church of his parents.

Revolutions, however, in education do not go backwards, and I remember the old adage, "Don't prophesy unless you know." If the State will so enlarge and beautify its system, like Mother England has recently done, we shall feel that justice and only justice shall have been accomplished. If it will not, then we shall go on, do the work of State, of the Church and of God in our school, educate our children for God and for country, awaiting the blessed hour when liberty of education shall be a fact as well as a title on the statute book.

In the meantime we may with a just pride look up and down the State of Massachusetts, and the same may be said of other States, and say: If Governor Winthrop, or Cotton Mather, or John Harvard or any of the many famous men of the early Massachusetts and other colonies were allowed, for the good of their spiritual health, to come back to the scenes of their manhood, they would look first of all for the great corner-stone of the foundation, for the beautiful inscription over the doorway of the school house: "To teach the principles of religion and the capital laws of the country." They would find them both, bright and strong and enduring, not in the State public schools, but in the Roman Catholic schools of Massachusetts.

Louis S. Walsh.

Boston, Mass.

IMPRESSIONS OF FRANCE TO-DAY.

I LANDED in France last September after twenty years' absence from Europe. Even then my acquaintance with the country had been only a few weeks' residence in Brittany and an excursion through part of Normandy. I was to see Paris for the first time, and my visit had all the charm of novelty. Most of my life had passed in California, where practically a new nationality is being formed almost visibly from half a dozen different races of men. The comparison of the new life of California with the old civilizations of Europe, where one generation has succeeded another in the same spot for many centuries, offered plenty of interest and instruction. From boyhood I had been fairly familiar with the details of French life as it was in the days of Louis Philippe and Charles X. My father had spent many years there, and he was fond of telling me his old experiences in Normandy and Picardy long before the days of railroads and modern tourists. To compare these accounts with life in France to-day was a favorite expectation of mine for many years. It was now to be made actually.

Another subject excited my curiosity in another direction. The late legislation of the French Government against liberty of association for religious objects had caused a painful impression among Catholics in America before my departure. It seemed hard to understand why, in a country where the great majority professed themselves Catholics, the practice of the religious life should be treated as a matter dangerous to the administration of government. In Ireland I found like sentiments prevailing among most Catholics. Some took the view that the ministry of M. Combes was preparing to follow the ways of Robespierre and close up the churches through France. I heard strange accounts of hostile demonstrations against the Catholic clergy by the populace in some districts, though it must be owned the details were rather misty. Still it was a matter of deep interest to see how far the public sentiment of the French people really stood towards the Church. Acquaintance with the workings of political parties in legislation at home warned me that law makers do not always represent the public sentiment by any means. French history further taught the same lesson. The expulsion of the Jesuits by the ministry of the Catholic Louis XV., the laws against Catholic schools under Louis Philippe and other historic instances showed that French political methods were not safely to be judged according to American

standards either of principle or expediency. I wished to see for myself the temper of the French people towards the Church, and to make out clearly the scope of the legislation against religious associations and the motives which inspired it. How far it was likely to be effective of the objects of its framers was another interesting question. The fate of the English Ecclesiastical Titles act suggests that administrations even supported by parliamentary majorities often find it harder to execute intolerant laws than to vote them.

A short stop at Amiens was my first introduction to French life at home. The city is a place of respectable size—fifty thousand or so—but it has never been a capital like many other smaller French towns. It is a good type of the ordinary provincial small city of Northern France, and little more. It is, of course, of venerable age to American notions, and most of the houses on its narrow streets were built before George Washington first saw daylight. They are clean and well kept for all their age, and the narrow streets were filled with an active, though not a rushing population. The first thing that strikes a stranger from America is the absence of shoving or rudeness on a crowded street here. It is quite different in that point from New York. The number of tables arranged on the sidewalks before the cafés was another novelty. The French style in drinking is quite new to Americans or English people. It is done in absolute publicity, and coffee is at least as common a tipple as anything else. Brandy or other strong drinks are hardly ever called for, and few seem to consume more than a single glass of wine or beer at a sitting. There was no sign of drunkenness anywhere, and the bulk of the population when work was over seem to find ample recreation in strolling on the streets or maybe listening to street musicians.

There were many new buildings going up around the city and new boulevards have been lately laid out. The stone used is like the famous limestone of Caen and hardens on exposure to the air. While the new Parliament houses at Westminster are crumbling away after forty years, the churches and houses of Amiens keep even fine carving perfectly good after five or six centuries. The general good humor of the people was very noticeable to a stranger coming from across the Channel. There was not loud talking or gesticulation. The mutual respect of French people of all classes for one another also strikes a stranger from America or England. There is no sign of impatience, and one hardly ever hears an angry word or sees a quarrel on the streets. The workingmen nearly all wear blue blouses, and seem to regard them with as much respect as a soldier does his uniform. Soldiers were numerous on

the streets of Amiens, but they did not form a class apart, as in England. There a private soldier is strictly excluded from restaurants or places of amusement of any pretension. In France the relations between the soldiers and the population are very much the same as those between the militia in an American State and the general public. At the restaurant of my hotel an officer and two or three soldiers, two Christian Brothers and a priest all sat down to dinner in perfect equality. The number of priests in their cassocks on the streets, as well as of Christian Brothers and Sisters of Charity, was quite large at Amiens. They seemed to be treated with as much respect as in Ireland and certainly more than in most parts of England.

The Cathedral is the great feature of Amiens in every sense. Its huge mass, covering nearly two acres and rising three hundred and seventy feet in the air, dominates the flat city from every point of view. Town hall, barracks, railroad station and courts of justice, though all fine buildings of their class, are wholly dwarfed by the majesty of the great house of worship. One sees its pictures at every turn, in shops, in restaurants and private houses, and the pride of the whole population in their Cathedral is greater than that of the good folk of Washington in the National Capitol. The citizens of the French town have fairly good reason for their pride. Though raised by the efforts of a small town and three or four of its Bishops during a period of fifty years, no English-speaking country has raised any church to compare with this, either in size or beauty of execution, since the Protestant Reformation. St. Paul's, the only English Cathedral of Protestant origin, is not to be compared with this monument of a small French country town, though the wealth of the kingdom was freely spent on it during nearly as long a period as that between the foundation and the consecration of the Amiens Cathedral. The first stone was laid in 1222, and an inscription on the front window still in existence tells how the nave was completed in 1269.

It gives an ordinary American a certain shock to meet a building seven hundred years old which still serves its original uses as perfectly as the day when it was consecrated. So it is in Amiens. Masses begin every day at 5 A. M. and are continued up to 11, when the canons sing the Solemn Mass as they sang it before Columbus sailed to discover the New World. The daily Masses, I must say, were well attended at the time of my visit. Early rising is the universal custom in France. Nearly every one seems to be up before six in summer and in the country towns most stores are open by eight o'clock. It is very different from London, where one finds it hard to get anything in a store before nine. The peculiar

English habit of celebrating Sunday by lying abed late is unknown in France.

The daily use of the old Cathedrals through France is in marked contrast with English treatment of the similar buildings handed down to them by Catholic times. York or Salisbury minsters are as large if less artistic than Amiens, and they are objects of as much local pride to the people of their towns, but their value is nearly all of an antiquarian kind. They play no part in the daily life of the existing generation like the Cathedral of Amiens does. It is indeed regarded by both people and government as a historical monument of priceless value, but it is above all the Cathedral church of the diocese, where the Bishop holds his regular seat as pastor and high priest. Within the church he is the supreme authority, both in the eyes of the people and of the civil authorities. It is easy to understand that this preëminence of a churchman in the most important building of the city often tends to irritate the self-importance of State functionaries, especially those new in office. Within the Cathedral, be it Amiens or Notre Dame, the Christian Bishop is the highest in place. King or President will be received with proper respect for their functions, but they have to recognize a power which does not come from the popular voice or any human source as that which controls the Church. This feeling can hardly be understood in America, but it strikes an observer everywhere in the old Catholic lands. It may explain one cause of the feeling which is rather vaguely known as anti-clericalism, and which has existed under various names in France almost as far as history can trace.

The perfection of the sculptured figures which adorn the portals of Amiens is astonishing. The newspaper philosophy of America which imagines the thirteenth century workman a stupid serf is blown away like a soap bubble in front of this Cathedral. It is not merely that the figures and drapery are well proportioned, but each bears out the character of the individual saint with a fullness of sympathy on the part of the sculptor that one seeks in vain in the statues that decorate the streets of London or New York. Hermit and Bishop, King and Judge, martyr and teacher, and humble peasants, like Genevieve or Isidore, who have found favor before God and His Church, are each portrayed with most artistic feeling of character in feature and attitude. The piety of Charlemagne and that of Bernard of Clairvaux are very differently expressed on the features of each as represented in the porch at Amiens by the mason workmen of seven hundred years ago. It gives one new ideas of mental culture to think that most of these artists could neither read nor write except maybe in Latin. There

was no French language at the time, as far as literature properly so called goes, though documents and ballads were drawn up in the still unformed dialect of the country. At Amiens a brief inscription in this old French gives the name of the master builder who laid the first stone of the Cathedral. He bears no title of nobility, but is simply Robert of Luzarches, his native village. The scanty records kept in the Cathedral itself show how little use was then made of writing in common life. The names most prominent in the building of the new Cathedral are given on a plate of copper formerly imbedded in the middle of the floor. It tells in quaint old French verse how the blessed Everard was the Bishop of this diocese when the work was commenced, and that the King of France then was Louis, son of Philip the Wise. The master of the work was Master Robert of Luzarches, and after him came Master Thomas of Cormot, and after him his son Regnault, who put the plate in place in the year of the Incarnation 1288. It seems rather democratic for the thirteenth century to find three mechanics sharing the honors of construction thus freely with Bishop and King five hundred years before our own Constitution was evolved in Philadelphia.

The short stop in Amiens had certainly called up a long train of thoughts. The Bishop commemorated as its founder was laid to rest in 1225, but he was the forty-fifth occupant of the See of Amiens. The present Cathedral replaced one burned down two years before, and which itself was the third church which had occupied the same place. What a glimpse these facts give of the duration of the Christian faith here in France through the storms of centuries and the changing passions of successive generations. In front of the Chapel of St. Francis certain marks in the pavement commemorate a massacre of a number of worshipers here by a Huguenot mob in 1561. It took place a couple of years after the unsuccessful attempt of the Picard Protestants under the guidance of Le Renaudie, to seize Francis the Second and his Queen while traveling from Paris and inaugurate a Huguenot government in their name. There was a remarkable likeness between the methods of these early Huguenots and those of Danton and Marat two hundred and thirty years later. Amiens tells something on this head not usually known to the average Englishman or American who takes his historical ideas from encyclopædias.

Paris in September showed little signs of the approach of winter. The trees along the streets and river were still, most of them, in foliage, the gardens gay with blossoms and the sidewalks in front of the restaurants and cafés covered with tables where the clients dined or breakfasted in the open air. The contrast is

striking between the life of London and Paris. The buildings in the latter, while at least equally solid, are erected with an eye to external grace which is absent in London. It is satisfactory to know that for the last twenty years American architects are turning more and more to French rather than English ideas in architecture. The extent of outdoor life at meals, and generally through the day, is what strikes most strangers from America. Loafers or idlers are much fewer than in New York or Philadelphia. It is significant that France has no general poor law system like England. Each department has a "Consul d'Assistance," which gives help in cases of necessity, but abject poverty, like that of the crowds that one sees thronging the public soup houses of New York in the winter, seems unknown in France. I learned that of ten millions of adult Frenchmen seven and a half were owners of real estate, and rather more than another million possessed property of some other kind. The "submerged tenth," of which one hears so much in England, seems to keep fairly afloat in France.

The Mayor of a small Italian town told me quite seriously that the tramp evil was a growing one in Italy. His commune has about seven thousand people, and two years ago he received from two to three applications a week for aid from travelers who professed to be looking for work in vain. His patience gave out when one who had received a franc from the city funds on the strength of a plausible story, returned in two months with another equally plausible, and different clothes. I condoled with my Italian friend, but thought, with a chuckle, how a California police officer would receive his tale of sorrows.

Paris is, of course, a modern city in the sense that its population is familiar with modern thought and ways, but the relics of the past are deeply planted there also. The first church which I entered, quite accidentally, was St. Germain des Pres, on the Boulevard St. Germain and near my hotel. The tower and nave of this parish church were built in the tenth century, nearly a thousand years ago. It is strange how easily modern French life adapts itself in its daily practices to buildings of forty generations ago for public worship.

One cannot help remarking how closely the main features of plan of the Gothic churches of the thirteenth or twelfth centuries are retained in the newer churches of Paris. St. Eustache's parish church is a good example. It was built about the time that Henry VIII. was sweeping away the English monasteries, and by an easy step in advance, having himself declared by Parliament the infallible Head of the Catholic Church within the limits of English rule. The French Church architect adopted the details of the new classical architecture which had come into fashion in France with the inva-

sions of Italy by Charles VIII. and Francis I. The planning and forms of St. Eustache's Church are, however, absolutely Gothic. A cruciform plan, with aisles running all around the central cross, behind the altar as well as on its sides, and a further row of aisles, divided into chapels of different saints, beyond these on the sides of the nave, is found in almost every old French church from the twelfth century, and it is retained in the new construction. One can find the same planning in the more modern churches like the Sorbonne and the Madeleine, of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries respectively. It is kept to in the churches of our own time. St. Augustine's and La Sainte Trinité are noble churches of the last fifty years, and are quite classical in their details, but the essential parts of their planning are the same as Notre Dame, which has towered over the city for nearly seven hundred years. Even in architecture, left free to its actual professors, the unchanging character of the worship and ritual of the Church proclaims itself in clear words in France to-day.

Masses begin very early in the Paris churches, and those before the parish Mass are, I should say, the best attended. The parish Mass is usually about nine or half-past nine, and is accompanied by a sermon and the organ, but the High Mass par excellence comes generally about eleven. Its is sung by three priests and is fairly well attended, though not as densely as some of the earlier Low Masses. The latter continue up to one o'clock P. M. in Paris. Considering the very large number of churches, it is quite a revelation to one who has been told by some pessimistic friend that religion is dying out in France to see the crowds at early Masses. The number who approach the altar rails is also very large, and on Saturdays the confessionals are well thronged in most churches. The respectful behavior of the congregations generally is very marked, especially at the High Masses. Decorum in church seems to be a point of education early taught to the children in France. The clergy carry out the services with an impressive solemnity which seems new though not overdone to an American Catholic. The High Mass is preluded by chanting in the choir and the celebrant, preceded by the Suisse, as the sacristan is universally styled in France, makes a procession through the passages to sprinkle the congregation with holy water before Mass. The uniform of the Suisse is usually gorgeous, with cocked hat and plume and occasionally even with sword on side. He announces at intervals to the congregation the important parts of the service, the collections for the poor and for the church building and the beginning of the sermon. He is, in fact, the ecclesiastical police officer now as in former times, and his presence seems to Frenchmen of every class

quite as natural in a church as that of a gendarme on the street. His dependant, however, is on the parish priest, not on the civil authority, though the latter recognizes his authority within the church building, and in cases of tumult or accident the city police will obey the call of the Suisse for assistance as they would that of one of their own body on duty outside.

Two among the churches in Paris attracted my special attention, though one of them has been taken possession of by the government as a State monument removed from clerical control. These are the Chapel of the Invalides and the Pantheon. The first contains the tomb of Napoleon, and forms part of the Hotel des Invalides, a purely military institution like the Soldiers' Home at Washington. I entered it a few days after my arrival in Paris with a lingering idea that in State institutions, at least, the mention of religion would be as carefully excluded as in the United States. To my surprise, I found a fine painting of the Mass at Bolsena, with the miraculous bleeding of the Sacred Host in the hands of an incredulous priest, in the court before the church and forming part of the soldiers' promenade. The whole court was filled with Catholic paintings, many of which seemed to bear witness very directly against the acts of the existing Administration, but which the officials seemed powerless to remove. The Victory of Constantine over the pagan Licinius was very conspicuous, as likewise scenes from the life of St. Martin of Tours, the champion monk and apostle of old Gaul. One could not but ask what effect such lessons would have on the minds of the old soldiers who pass by them day after day. Most of those I met certainly admired them as works of art, and I heard no word of unbelief or disgust at the subjects portrayed such as one almost invariably hears when three or four Protestant tourists from England or America find themselves face to face with scenes of Catholic history. One finds a good many soldiers, it may be added, at Mass in the churches of France. The feelings of the army do not seem to be in accord with the present majority in the Legislature on the subject of religion.

The Pantheon is still more suggestive. Originally built as a votive church to receive the shrine of St. Genevieve, the patroness of Paris since the fifth century, it was just completed when the Jacobin mob of Paris assumed control of the government of France. The building was seized as State Pantheon to receive the bodies and statues of the new line of great citizens which the orators of the Reign of Terror believed would begin with their new calendar. Voltaire and Jean Jacques Rousseau found entrance there on account of their hostility to Christianity, and a few heroes of the hour like Mirabeau and Marat received the same distinction. The Cath-

olic dedication, "Deo Optimo Maximo sub invocatione Stae Genovefae" was cut out and replaced by "A Grateful Country to Its Great Men," and the cross was cut away from the crown of the dome. The Madeleine at the same time was turned to almost a similar purpose and other churches were utilized for hay-barns.

The attempt to make a new worship like the new swstem of weights and measures came to an end with its first high priest, Robespierre, but the Catholic churches still were held by his successors in power until Napoleon, when First Consul, restored the public exercise of religion in France. Even then the Church of St. Genevieve was partly kept under State control as a kind of temple of Napoleonic glories. Mass was again celebrated there, but the public celebrations were limited to four in the year and the occasions of burials within the crypts. These were decreed as privileges to the marshals and high officials of the new empire and about forty found burial there during the First Empire.

On its downfall the government of Louis XVIII. restored the Pantheon to the ordinary jurisdiction of the Church. The original inscription on the pediment was replaced, and for some years the basilica did not differ from any other Paris church. The revolutionary leaders who placed Louis Philippe on the throne in 1830 again secularized it, and the inscription "A Grateful Country to Its Great Men" was once more graved on its front and the cross removed from its cupola. Twenty-two years later Louis Napoleon, as President of the second Republic, restored the building to the Church, and again, after thirty-three years more, it was seized by the State under the inspiration of Gambetta. The attempt to remove the cross this time, however, failed for some cause not clearly known, and it still crowns the majestic dome.

The attempts of the politicians of three generations to found a temple to humanity as distinct from its Creator have had a strange result. During the time between the first and second State seizures St. Genevieve's Church had been nobly decorated with works of the first artists of France. Puy de Chavannes, Meissonier and Laurens had told the life and deeds of the shepherdess who has been the chosen patroness of the capital of France for fourteen centuries. Baron Gros had covered the ceiling with her enrolment among the blessed in heaven. Other artists had filled the rest of the walls with figures of the chief saints of France and elsewhere and told the story of how religion had been linked with every advance of the French people. The infidel ministry on seizing the church and proclaiming it a temple of humanity did not dare to remove these masterpieces, and there is no room for others beside them. Accordingly, on entering the Pantheon, under the inscription which

tells of its dedication by a grateful country to its great men, one is met by the statues of St. Denis, St. Martin, St. Remy, St. Eloy, St. Gregory of Tours, St. Bernard, Vincent de Paul and St. John de la Salle. The walls tell the story of the conversion of Clovis, the deeds of Charlemagne, St. Louis and Joan of Arc for France under the inspiration of religion, and show a solemn procession to the shrine of St. Genevieve, which the Jacobins burned on the streets of Paris with the inauguration of their new cult. The interior of the building is an apology of the noblest kind for the Christian faith from whose service the temporary rulers of France have tried in vain to remove it. Their work recalls that undertaken of old by Balaam and its results.

The shrine of St. Genevieve destroyed by the Paris mob has been replaced since by another modeled on its pattern. The stone coffin in which the remains of the saint rested for fourteen hundred years escaped destruction. It is now kept at St. Etienne's until such time as it may once again return to the Pantheon. The shrine is a marvel of artistic metalwork. The walls of the chapel in which it is kept are literally covered with votive offerings. It would seem to show that devotion to the humble nun has not by any means died out in modern Paris. The Church of St. Etienne is itself one of the most interesting in Paris. Its foundation goes back to the days of the Roman Empire, and the tomb of St. Clothilde, the wife of Clovis, who founded the French monarchy, and of the second Bishop of Paris, who died in the year 500, are still preserved within its precincts. The existing church, however, was rebuilt in the sixteenth century in the picturesque style then ruling in French architecture. In its nave two slabs mark the graves of Racine, the greatest of French poets, and of Blaise Pascal.

A run out of Paris through Touraine, in the beginning of October, gave a good opportunity to compare the country life of France with the ways of the capital and likewise with country existence in other lands. I took the train to Orleans and thence walked a good deal of the way to Tours and back to Vendome. A small waterproof satchel and cape were all the baggage needed for a week, and they offered no difficulty in packing on foot. Orleans is a well built city, but its architecture generally offers no special features of its own such as one meets in other French cities even smaller. The houses are mostly high, with square windows and doors something of the type which it has become the fashion in America to style colonial. The Orleans houses are mostly plastered outside, which gives a dingy effect on general view. The features of the population show a more southern type than that common in Paris, and the men seem taller and stronger. They seem to care less for

foreign visitors than at Amiens, and modern improvements in the hotels are fewer, though the city has some street car lines and is well paved and lighted by electricity. White coal, by the way, is a popular name in France for electric power. The coal supply of France is comparatively small, and for domestic use wood is chiefly used.

At Orleans, as at Amiens, the Cathedral is the most important building of the city. Its two towers are finished without steeples, and the front is not by any means equal to Amiens, yet the whole is noble and impressive. The portals have little statuary in their decoration. The Huguenots of the sixteenth century destroyed the images of saints with an iconoclastic hatred like that of the Scotch Calvinists in their land. Henry IV., after his reception into the Church, undertook the restoration of the half-ruined Cathedral, and in consequence many of its details are classic, though the original Cathedral is Gothic. However, the union of the two styles is not uncommon in France and is generally managed with good taste. The interior is rich in stained glass, many of the windows being devoted to the deeds of Joan of Arc for the deliverance of France from the English invaders and her judicial murder at their hands at last. Each window has a legend in old French explaining its meaning, but most of the glass seems new. The heroine of France found no more favor with the Huguenot fanatics than the shepherdess patroness of Paris did with the worshipers of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. History repeats itself under various names when one gets a chance to study it on its own ground.

From Orleans a walk of a few hours brought me to a monument of another kind. The Chateau of Chambord, built by Francis I. in the middle of a forest in the sixteenth century, is kept up by the government as a national monument. It is very impressive in its solitude, with only a few guardians to care for its interior and the forest all around. The old French monarchs and nobles, like some of the wealthy of strenuous turn of mind in our own times, seem to have regarded hunting wild animals as the highest pleasure of life. All the royal residences in the country have forests close by, and Versailles itself is as completely surrounded by its woods as Amboise. It makes one muse to see how churches and other buildings devoted to religious uses continue to serve their purpose indefinitely in Catholic lands, while the other public buildings have largely become only museums to show the life of the past. The Chateau of Chambord and the Cathedral of Amiens are an interesting contrast to-day.

A curious construction near Amboise draws attention from a distance. It is a brick tower of several stories about two hundred

feet high and built as an imitation of the Chinese pagoda tower of Nanking in the eighteenth century. It was a caprice of the Duc de Choiseuil, the Minister of Louis XV., who was the chief agent in the war on the Jesuits which led to the temporary suppression of their order. Choiseuil's tower is built with comic ignorance of Chinese forms. Its details are simply Greek, and its resemblance to Chinese work is something like that which Fluellen found between Macedonia and Monmouth.

From Chambord to Blois is only about ten miles. The first part lay through the forest of Loigny, which in old days furnished an abode to the deer and boars whom the courtiers loved to slay. At present its chief use is to supply the country around with firewood. What are called forests in France are rather large plantations of young trees, few being allowed to live long enough to reach a foot in diameter. Some old ones, however, are saved, more as a matter of ornament than commercial profit. The care for preserving the forests shown in France is very unlike the ruthless waste with which our noble American forests are destroyed. The cutting and replanting even on lands of private ownership are strictly regulated by law, and forest land may not be stripped of trees at the whim or avarice of a proprietor. The woodchoppers and charcoal burners form a large element in the French rural population. It is curious to an American eye to note the huge bundles of fagots of branches everywhere along the forest roads. The French seem to have a hatred of wanton waste quite distinct from the idea of money-making by thrift. It has become a part of their nature through centuries of training, and nowhere does it show itself more than in the care with which the smallest products of the forests are made useful for human life.

After leaving the forest the country looks like a landscape of Claude Lorraine. There are no hedges anywhere and vineyards, meadows, pasture, orchards and woods all pass one into the other as forests mix with prairie in the uncultivated districts of our own land. The Loire, a wide, shallow stream, flows through the orchards and grass plots as free from banks or roads as any American river in the far West. The whole country was well cultivated and at every mile or two small villages, each with its church spire towering over the farmhouses, showed against the sky. The cultivation was of nearly every kind. Rows of vines alternated with potato furrows and patches of grass where children or old men watched the cows or sheep to see they did not foray on the crops near by. The spade seemed in constant use, and the manure heaps near every cottage showed the old traditions of farm work almost unknown in America. The whole country is divided into small properties, fif-

teen or twenty acres being quite a large farm. As it was the vintage the whole population, men, women and children, were all at work abroad with a good deal of singing and laughter among them. I could not but think with a smile of the lament of some American society menders over the degradation of the farm laborer and the hard lot of the "man with the hoe." The French peasants of Touraine certainly did not seem to know their woes or their privation of journalistic cultivation.

The persistence of old ways of life in the country parts of France is well worthy of note. The need of water is still met by draw wells, often with handsome surrounding walls. The people come to fill their buckets at these with a blissful indifference to the value of windmills or pumps, though both have existed here for centuries. The farmhouses seem, most of them, to have been built long before the Revolution, and many are evidently three or four hundred years old. The average French farmer preserves the house of his father and grandfather as he keeps his Sunday suit, partly through the thrifty habit and partly through sentiment. This continuance of the old dwellings strikes an American keenly in France. It would seem to suggest that the changes popularly supposed to have been made in the condition of the French working classes are almost pure romance. Outside France people take the rhetoric of the French politicians and romance writers more seriously than they are taken at home.

Measured by the popular American standard Blois would be little more than a large village. It has only twenty-four thousand people, who seem comfortable, but not specially given to commercial enterprise. Blois, however, has played quite a large part in French history, and its public buildings are most interesting. The chateau, once the royal residence of the French Kings, from Louis XI., before the discovery of America, to Henry III. and his mother Catherine de Medicis, is kept in perfect condition as a national monument. Its interior is in the same condition as it was three hundred years ago, and the guide shows the place where the Duke of Guise and his brother, the Cardinal of Lorraine, were slain by order of the excited King, who a little afterwards was himself to die by the hand of an assassin. There is also a large gallery of historic portraits in the chateau. The building itself is most attractive to the student of architectural history. One portion built in the Gothic of the fifteenth century is credited to Louis Onze, the old French statesman who first substituted political statecraft for military prowess as the mainstay of government. Another wing is in the combination of Gothic and classic forms introduced to France in the next century after the invasions of Italy by Charles

VIII. and Francis I. Still another portion is of the time of Louis XIII. and was the work of his brother, Gaston of Orleans. Each builder added in the style of his own day, but none thought of removing the older work to any serious extent. This temper seems universal in France in church as well as in secular buildings.

Blois has at least four handsome churches, including the Cathedral. Like that of Orleans this fared badly at the hands of the Huguenot vandals of the sixteenth century. The empty niches in the portals and the mutilated heads of angels and saints in the arches tell plainly the story of the spirit that was abroad in France during the last sixty years of the sixteenth century. One realizes how formidable was the party which aspired to supremacy in France with a Huguenot King at the close of the sixteenth century and which had given such sanguinary earnest of its hostility to the Church in Beam, in Nimes and in Orleans. Yet the Huguenots are now but a name in France, while the desecrated churches are still filled with worshipers as they had been for centuries before Calvin and Coligny. The churches certainly were all well filled on the Sunday I passed in Blois, and the Vesper services in the afternoon only little less attended. If religion is dying out in France, as I have seen it prognosticated in some American Catholic journals, the fact is not evident to any intelligent traveler in France. The politicians certainly raise occasional cries of war, as various sections do in our own land, but the general population shows no desire to forsake the worship so intimately bound up with its daily existence.

From Blois I paid a visit to Amboise, a picturesque village on the Loire, with another royal chateau scarcely less famous than that of Blois. I found an old church near by still serving which evidently had been built in the twelfth century, or before the Cathedral of Amiens. The Capets, the Valois and the Bourbons, the Albigenses, the Huguenots and the great Revolution have all come and gone while successive generations at this little town have worshiped uninterruptedly in this old building. It makes one wonder what will be its fate when M. Combes and the existing majority of the day have gone the way of all flesh. I found another village church of the same date a few miles further at St. Martin le Beau. The good people of the village inn knew well how old their church was, but saw nothing remarkable in the fact. The indestructibility of the Catholic Church as a whole is a matter on which they seem to have no more doubts than about the daily return of the sun. They find it quite natural that a village church well built should last six or seven centuries.

From Amboise to Tours is a delightful trip in the autumn months.

The view after leaving St. Martin, where the old church stands, is an ideal one for pastoral scenery. As the road approaches the Loire it is bordered by steep limestone bluffs, in many of which the population has dug out cellars and stables. Even some dwellings are formed in these rocky fronts, which run a distance of some miles, from eighty to a hundred feet high. A very handsome little Gothic church rises on top of one of these bluffs. Its tower and nave are of the same period as Notre Dame at Paris, but a new front in Gothic style has been recently added at public expense and bears the words "Republique Française" on its pediment. It seems strange that the very ministry which is trying to expel the Catholic teaching orders from France should find itself forced as a matter of necessity to repair the churches and construct new ones where demanded by public opinion. Just at the time of my stay M. Combes, the author of the measure against the teaching orders, made an official visit to Clermont, in Auvergne. The Bishop urged some needed repairs to the Cathedral and Combes promised to do all he could to have them promptly executed.

Tours is a name of importance through France, though its population seems small to American eyes. It has less than seventy thousand people, perhaps half that of Syracuse or Rochester. Yet its name has gone forth to the ends of the earth. It dawns upon one after a moment's thought that time counts in human work. Tours has been a city for fifty generations of men, and each generation has done its work and left much of it to live after during the centuries when only the beasts of the forests or a few Indian warriors occupied the sites of New York and Philadelphia.

The citizens of Tours feel as much pride in their city and its history as Chicago does in its stockyards of unequaled dimensions. They delight to honor the names of famous citizens. On entering the city across the bridge one is confronted by statues of Rabelais and Descartes, and a little further by that of Honore Balzac, the Walter Scott of France. Whatever one thinks of the philosophy of Descartes or the personal character of Rabelais, there need be no question of the intellectual greatness of these three sons of Tours. Within the city, however, they are dwarfed by the name of one now fourteen centuries in the grave, but whose memory still holds sway over the city. Martin of Tours, the soldier, monk, bishop and apostle, is the name above all others honored everywhere in Tours. His relics, like those of St. Genevieve at Paris, were burned by the Huguenots in the sixteenth century, but a small part has been saved. A great new basilica of St. Martin has been built quite recently, largely by the help of M. Dupont, who is commonly known here as "the saint" of Tours. Two miles from the city the old Abbey of

Marmoulier, where St. Martin spent his first years in the monastic life and where St. Patrick came to prepare for his mission to Ireland, still stands. Over its portal is an old equestrian figure of Martin while still a soldier dividing his military cloak with a shivering old man by the roadside. The action in itself seems an ordinary one, but its memory somehow has kept fresh through fifteen hundred years. One asks what particular deed of the nineteenth or twentieth century can best look for a like memory? It will hardly be the vote of the French Assembly against monks as teachers.

Tours itself has a great secular history. It was here that Charles Martel, three hundred years after St. Martin's death, hurdled back the great Mahometan army of invasion which aspired to make Christian France subject to the Calephs by the Euphrates. The strenuous life was the chief article in the Mahometan creed then as now, and the growth of the Saracen Empire within a century surpassed in extent that of the United States to-day. From Spain to India the successor of Mahomet ruled with absolute mastery, and the Mediterranean was scarcely more than a lake within his dominions. Tours has seen the first great check to the spread of Mahometan conquest, but it was seven hundred years before Isabella and Ferdinand won back the last patch of Spanish soil from the invader. Through all those years and changes the memory of the ancient monk St. Martin has never grown dim in the city by the Loire, where he lived and worked so faithfully in the fifth century

The Loire at Tours is wider than the Seine at Paris, but much shallower. Many sand bars show in its channel and give it the look of an American river in the far West. The number of anglers along its banks was enormous, as indeed I found it everywhere on the rivers near French cities. The French angler seems to be the perfect type of patience. I watched him individually and in crowds along the Seine, the Somme, the Loire and the Rhone, but I must confess that I never was rewarded by the sight of a single capture. The nearest approach to such an occurrence was at Tours. A fisherman with a rod of the smallest dimensions actually hooked a good-sized fish. I watched the captive on the surface of the water for a couple of minutes. The angler was unfortunately located on a steep bank about five feet above the swift current. He made a desperate effort to haul up his prey with a rod about the thickness of a fancy cane, which bent like a whip with the weight of the fish until the hook finally broke. I was left without any further opportunity of discovering what kind of fish the anglers of France pursue so constantly. The only further information I received was from a brilliant article in the *Patrie* on the best methods of catching

"gudgeon." The average length of that choice fish is about three inches, and a dozen make a fair breakfast dish.

Tours is a better looking city in regard to its buildings than Orleans. The Prefecture, the Museum and the School of Fine Arts are very imposing along the river front. They all belong to the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, but seem to serve their purposes to-day perfectly well. The work of tearing down, which furnishes so much employment in many modern cities, seems to be unknown in Tours. The Hotel de Ville and Palace of Justice are also fine buildings, but the Cathedral towers above them all conspicuously, and the new Basilica of St. Martin is scarcely smaller.

The castle of Luynes, on the other side of the Loire, a couple of miles down, was nearly as important at one time as Amboise, but is now only tenanted by a guardian. It is a good example of a mediæval fortress before the use of artillery, and from the top of its walls the view is very fine over the rich valley of the Loire and the adjoining city. The remains of an old Roman aqueduct near by tell of still earlier times when Tours was still a city. The Abbey of Marmoulier is up the river on the same bank, but in an opposite direction from the bridge. It must have been of great extent in old days from the detached fragments of old walls and towers scattered around for nearly half a mile along the river's side. Only a few buildings are still in good preservation. They are enclosed in the grounds of a convent. It brings strange feelings to an Irishman to stand on the spot where St. Patrick dwelt and prayed before he heard the mystic call from the children of the wood of Focluth by the Western Sea.

Vendome, a small town of Touraine, was my next stopping place. I left Tours early and purposed to spend some time at Chateau Renault, another of the historic castles of Touraine. On getting there, however, I was rather taken aback to find the distance to Vendome was twenty-five kilometres instead of fifteen, which I had expected. It was two o'clock, and as the sun would set at half-past five there was nothing for it but to hurry on without stop to Vendome. The road was the national highway from Paris to Bayonne and nearly as straight as an arrow, with rows of poplars stretching along both sides as far as the eye could reach. It was dark when I reached Vendome, and I hunted up a hotel at once. After dinner, as it was moonlight, I wandered around to see what I could of the town. Vendome is only a place of ten thousand inhabitants, but like larger French towns it has a public place, with the statue of a distinguished son of the city to adorn it. I looked to see who it might be that Vendome had delighted to honor and felt a curious thrill when I read "Rochambeau" by the moonlight. The colleague

of Washington at Yorktown was a native of Vendome, and his effigy stands in its public place. I had seen the statue of Cornwallis already in St. Paul's Cathedral. I confess I felt kindly towards him, and thought as an American citizen that if his countrymen gave him a statue for his surrender I had no objections to offer. Did not Paul Jones once promise to make a duke of the captain of the Serapis in case he got a chance to take him in again? It was with a very different feeling that I examined the statue of Rochambeau by moonlight in that quiet French village.

I spent the morning in examining the buildings of this French village. There was an old chateau on a hill near by, but now nearly ruined. The ground around it is laid out as a park, and from its summit a glorious view of the country is to be had. The Mairie of the town is a curious Gothic building of the fifteenth century. A large building of the time of Louis XIV. is now used as a public museum. The town also has a fine public hospital and a large barrack, all more than a hundred years old. There was an abbey here in former days, of which only detached parts yet remain. One of these is a lofty clock tower on the Place de Rochambeau.

There are three or four churches in Vendome. The largest is nearly the dimensions of St. Patrick's Cathedral, in New York, but has only one tower. The windows are, many of them, still filled with quaint old stained glass of the fifteenth century or earlier, though there are also many new windows. Like the Sainte Chapelle at Paris this Vendome church seems to have escaped the vandals of the brief Jacobin rule which was particularly destructive to the old stained glass of the churches. The buildings, both secular and ecclesiastical, are certainly remarkable for a country town which has never held any higher place in history. The steady industry of a population, continued through many generations, seems capable of effecting really great things in France.

The visit of the King and Queen of Italy to Paris happened after my return from Touraine. The reception was very friendly. There had been bad blood between France and Italy for the last twenty years owning to the Triple Alliance. Latterly since the exit from office of the late unlamented Crispi, the statesmen of both countries had been gradually becoming more friendly. A new commercial treaty was recently concluded, and the French public seemed to use the visit of Vittorio Emmanuele III. as a good occasion to cultivate further friendly relations between the two countries. It was wholly a matter of business, and in this respect was not unlike the reception given Edward VII. in Dublin a couple of months earlier. The display of illuminations in Paris was considerable, and the Crown of Italy was freely displayed among other motives. It does not

seem as if the French people have any wild hatred of monarchy in the abstract at present, though all classes seem to agree that republicanism is the only form of rule suited for France just now. The Italian King and Queen, it may be added, publicly attended Mass on Sunday. There seems no desire in Italy to cut loose from the Catholic Church, however anxious some of its rulers may be to cultivate the friendship of non-Catholic nations.

The strike at Armentieres was an incident of nearly the time of the visit of the Italian sovereigns. It was preceded by strikes in some smaller towns which did not differ much in details from like occurrences in the United States. The workmen demanded shorter hours and more pay, the employers declared they could not grant the demands and resist foreign competition at the same time. At Armentieres, according to the Paris papers, the Mayor of the town was a pronounced socialist, and when a deputation of the strikers called on him he assured them that it was not a strike, but a revolution, which was on hand, and he was not about to oppose. The strikers thereon burned a dozen or more houses without interference until finally troops were sent to protect the lives and property of the citizens. The Mayor received no censure from the ministry, and the whole affair caused much alarm among the business community. As more than four-fifths of the heads of families in France are property owners, militant socialism is looked on with grave apprehension by the bulk of the population quite independent of their other feelings on its morality. The occurrences at Armentieres seem to have given a severe shock to the composite party combine or "Bloc" which M. Combes has formed among the politicians of the Assembly and Senate. The "Bloc" is comparatively new in French politics and has given its deviser a longer lease of power than falls to the lot of most French ministries. One may gather from the journals that its majority is secured by the adherence of two elements usually disposed to act on their own initiative, but which now in American terms have "pooled their issues" with the Prime Minister for a certain share in the offices and the adoption of certain planks in his party platform. The Masonic body, which though not numerous has much financial influence through its Jewish members, and the socialists form these two elements in the following of M. Combes. The attack on the teaching orders is credited by the French Catholic press chiefly to the Masonic section. The socialists joined in it merely as a part of their general desire for a total remodeling of society. The price of their adherence to the Prime Minister's policy was mainly of another kind. It was the appointment of a certain number of the party to office and allowing them to profess revolutionary teachings with the apparent

approval of the government. It was on this understanding, it is said, that the Mayor of Armentieres was allowed impunity in his encouragement of lawlessness. How long the combination of these elements will continue it is not easy to say, but certainly it has not the elements of stability in its own nature. For the bulk of the French people to-day it is safe to say that there is no special hostility to the Church or its doctrines of recent growth or its members. There are many indifferent, but also a very large number of practical and devout Catholics in France to-day. The Catholic religion is bound up with the life, the habits, the morality and the traditions of the population to a degree which an American finds it hard to realize if only familiar with the public indifference to religion of his own government and the variety of sects which claim its authority at discretion. It does not seem likely that a political combination in the Parliament of to-day will succeed in a task where Huguenot and Jacobin have failed so signally—the destruction of the Church in France.

B. J. Clinch.

Florence, Italy.

A NOTED PIONEER CONVERT OF NEW ENGLAND: REV. JOHN THAYER, 1758-1815.

THAT eminent historian of the Church, Rohrbacher, in the twenty-eighth volume of his great "Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise Catholique," devotes a number of pages to the conversion of Father John Thayer, of Boston; but, for want of necessary data, the interesting narrative ceases with the first Synod of Baltimore, which assembled on November 7, 1791, and which was attended by Father Thayer on November 10. The prominence and importance attaching to the life, services and example of this early and distinguished convert will enhance at the present time the interest of American Catholics in a more detailed account of him, especially as his conversion at Rome, in 1783, at the time of the death of St. Benedict Joseph Labre, was influenced by the example, the virtues and the miracles of that humble and holy man, who, in our own day, has been canonized as a saint by the Church.

John Thayer was the third son of Cornelius Thayer, and was born in Boston about the year 1758. His family enjoyed high social position and easy circumstances, and was one of the oldest and most widely connected in New England. His early years were not

studious years, for he refused to study until about his sixteenth year, when he entreated his parents to send him to school. Under the Rev. Dr. Chauncey, that celebrated Puritan minister, he made great progress, both in letters and Puritan training, and on the conclusion of his studies he was made a minister of the Puritan or Congregational sect. After his ordination in that communion he served for two years as chaplain to the Governor of Massachusetts at Castle William, and devoted himself chiefly to preaching and to the study of Sacred Scripture.

In 1781 he was providentially seized with a desire to go abroad and to travel in Europe. In his own account of his proposed travels he thus writes: "I felt a secret inclination to travel. I nourished the desire and formed a resolution of passing into Europe to learn the languages which are most in use, and to acquire a knowledge of the constitution of States, of the manners, customs, laws and governments of the principal nations, in order to acquire, by this political knowledge, a greater consequence in my own country, and thus become more useful to it. Such were my human views, without the least suspicion of the secret designs of Providence, which was preparing for me more precious advantages."

The religious atmosphere in which he lived may be judged from the facts that prior to our Declaration of Independence and during the colonial period under Great Britain there was scarcely a colony in which the Catholic religion was not proscribed in one form or another, Pennsylvania and Maryland being the only colonies where a Catholic priest was even tolerated. In his native city one of the citizens had attempted with his sword to cut out the cross of St. George from the British flag, and was applauded.

The story of the attempt to cut the cross of St. George from the British flag, which is an authenticated historic occurrence, was no doubt one of the early traditions that tended greatly to form the character of that idle and listless boy, whose mind was wafted away from serious and useful study by the more fascinating literature of the New England nursery and the Puritan folklore of the eighteenth and preceding centuries.

But there were other historic legends, such as the stories of the misfortunes and sufferings of the exiled Acadians, which were in universal vogue in the boyhood of young Thayer, and which tended greatly to increase his religious aversions.

During the colonial period, under the severe rule of the Puritans, there was no admission for Catholics as voluntary comers or immigrants. Catholic immigration was most strictly prohibited. The only Catholics the ancestors or even the parents of our convert ever

saw were some unfortunates sold to New England masters as slaves, or others at later periods bound to them in service as redemptioners. It is a fact of official record that whenever any of these unfortunate Catholics, either as servants or as sailors, had an opportunity on board a vessel to visit Canada, the first words they uttered on landing were to ask for a priest, that they might receive the sacraments of confession and communion. And thus an English-speaking priest was stationed on the request of French officials at St. John's, as stated in the French official documents as quoted by Father Fitton, "for the benefit of the Catholics of Boston."

The military authorities and the soldiers and militia of Massachusetts had taken an active and, in fact, a leading part in the conquest of Nova Scotia by the English, which led to the cruel exile of the Acadians. Two New England officers, Colonel Winslow and Captain Mallay, and their fellow-officers, soldiers and the New England militia, by orders of the colonial and home governments, had been effective agents in that bad chapter of history, which relates to that sad catastrophe, the exile of the poor and unfortunate Acadians. Taken by surprise, the peaceful and harmless Acadians, while driven from their houses, saw their villages and farmhouses and crops plundered and then burned and themselves and their families, to the number of eighteen thousand, at different times, carried off into the most cruel exile and forced upon the cold charities of unwilling New England populations. These sad and cruelly treated exiles, reduced suddenly from the station of independent farmers and proprietors to that of paupers, were landed at different points along our coasts in a condition of utter poverty and misery, destitute even of the consolations of their religion and of the ministrations of its apostolate.

Of the numerous colonies of expatriated Acadians, who were ruthlessly dropped along the shores of New England and other more southern communities, many died of hunger, cold, suffering or of a broken heart. The young children of these were left even more destitute, if possible, and bequeathed to strangers, speakers of a different language, supporters of a different faith and hostile and alien to their race, sympathies and traditions; and other some escaping to the woods, struggled amid every suffering and privation of worn foot travelers until they arrived at Nova Scotia or reached Canada or Madawaska. At Madawaska, on the waters of the Madawaska river and other affluents of the St. John, they founded a colony which survives to the present time. To the Acadians the French inhabitants of Nova Scotia, all Catholics and the descendants of Catholic forefathers of consecutive centuries past, in New England, the ministrations of their priests were for-

bidden; for Catholic priests were not allowed an entrance into the Commonwealths, where now, under the progress of more enlightened thought, Catholics abound. The lives and even the deaths of the exiles were destitute of every corporal and spiritual comfort.

The exile of the Acadians from the land of their birth, their homes, their traditions, their race and their religion was principally accomplished by the two New England officers, Winslow and Mallay, in 1756, two years before the birth of young Thayer, but his sixteen years of listless, impressionable and uneducated youth were nourished with the current tales of Acadian worthlessness, ignorance, bigotry and superstition. If as late as 1835 Williamson, the historian of Maine, published his anathema, as unhistoric as it is untrue, that "The Neutrals," for such was the name they bore in connection with the political struggles of Nova Scotia, "are still ignorant, bigoted Catholics, broken-spirited, poor and ignorant," what must have been the prejudice and aversion with which young Thayer, in common with his contemporaries, viewed them and all Catholics.

Whatever political reasons England may have supposed justified the harsh measure of expatriating the entire French population of Acadia, consisting of eighteen thousand souls, there can be no excuse for the cruel manner in which it was carried out. The Acadians were compelled to give up their property; their homes and crops were burned before their eyes; they were hurried on shipboard so precipitately that families and friends were separated entirely, and many forever, and few escaped the evil days by fleeing to the woods. They were actually dumped by shiploads along the coasts of New England and to the south as far as Georgia. Williamson's estimate was that in which all Catholics were then held in New England. Such were the traditions inherited by the youth of New England. An idle and unstudious boy like John Thayer partook largely of the inheritance.

The first act of retributive justice was the conversion of the young New England boy, who witnessed the second stage of this cruel tragedy in his native State of Massachusetts and city of Boston, and whose fathers and kindred, as prominent Boston families, had, no doubt, taken an active part in its execution.

The second stage of retributive justice was the beautiful poem of Longfellow, New England's unofficial poet laureate, which immortalized the "Land of Evangeline" and sang of the sisterly love, self-sacrifice, the suffering, the griefs, the travels and the agonies of the beautiful and good Evangeline, Acadia's fairest daughter, in her drear search through many vast lands and among many strange peoples for her exiled and lost brother, Gabriel—a most touching

and sad instance of the frequent separation and breaking up of families, with cases of which the wholesale exile of the Acadians is replete. While the poetry of "Evangeline" possesses the true Olympian beauty of creative sentiment and classic expression, there is more true history in Longfellow's poem than can be found in Mr. William Durkee Williamson's "History of Maine" on the subject of the Acadians, whose author did not leave his native England until half a century after their exile was effected. When John Thayer subsequently wrote that of "the Catholic faith the majority of Americans have so mistaken an idea," he sounded the first note of the second stage of retribution. Now here is Longfellow's ideal view of the "Land of Evangeline," the true Acadia, of the stern and fiery measure that separated brother from sister and broke up their families and sent them into exile, and of the love which the Acadians bore to one another.

SCENES FROM "EVANGELINE."

THE LAKES OF THE ATCHAFALAYA.

Water-lilies in myriads rocked on the slight undulation
Made by the passing oars, and, resplendent in beauty, the lotus
Lifted her golden crown above the heads of the boatmen.
Faint was the air with the odorous breath of magnolia blossoms,
And with the heat of noon; and numberless sylvan islands,
Fragrant and thickly embowered with blossoming hedges of roses,
Near to whose shores they glided along, invited to slumber.
Soon by the fairest of these their weary oars were suspended,
Under the boughs of Wachita willows, that grew by the margin,
Safely their boat was moored; and scattered about on the greensward,
Tired with their midnight toil, the weary travellers slumbered.
Over them vast and high extended the cope of a cedar.
Swinging from its great arms, the trumpet-flower and the grape-vine
Hung their ladder of ropes aloft like the ladder of Jacob,
On whose pendulous stairs the angels ascending, descending,
Were the swift humming-birds that flitted from blossom to blossom.
Such was the vision Evangeline saw, as she slumbered beneath it.
Filled was her heart with love, and the dawn of an opening heaven
Lighted her soul in sleep with the glory of regions celestial.

Nearer and ever nearer, among the numberless islands,
Darted a light, swift boat, that sped away o'er the water,
Urged on its course by the sinewy arms of hunters and trappers.
Northward its prow was turned, to the land of the bison and beaver.
At the helm sat a youth, with countenance thoughtful and careworn.
Dark and neglected locks overshadowed his brow, and a sadness
Somewhat beyond his years on his face was legibly written.
Gabriel was it, who, weary with waiting, unhappy and restless,
Sought in the Western wilds oblivion of self and of sorrow.
Swiftly they glided along, close under the lee of the island,
But by the opposite bank, and behind a screen of palmettos,
So that they saw not the boat, where it lay concealed in the willows,
All undisturbed by the dash of their oars, and unseen were the sleepers.
Angel of God was there none to awaken the slumbering maiden.
Swiftly they glided away, like the shade of a cloud on the prairie.
After the sound of their oars on the tholes had died in the distance,
As from a magic trance the sleepers awoke, and the maiden
Said with a sigh to the friendly priest: "O Father Felician!
Something says in my heart that near me Gabriel wanders.
Is it a foolish dream, an idle and vague superstition?
Or has an angel passed and revealed the truth to my spirit?"
Then, with a blush, she added: "Alas for my credulous fancy!
Unto ears like thine such words as these have no meaning."
But made answer the reverend man, and he smiled as he answered:

"Daughter, thy words are not idle, nor are they to me without meaning.
Feeling is deep and still; and the word that floats on the surface
Is as the tossing buoy, that betrays where the anchor is hidden.
Therefore trust to thy heart, and to what the world calls illusions.
Gabriel truly is near thee; for not far away to the southward,
On the banks of the Têche, are the towns of St. Maur and St. Martin.
There the long-wandering bride shall be given again to her bridegroom,
There the long-absent pastor regain his flock and his sheepfold.
Beautiful is the land, with its prairies and forests of fruit-trees;
Under the feet a garden of flowers, and the bluest of heaven
Bending above, and resting its dome on the walls of the forest.
They who dwell there have named it the Eden of Louisiana."
With these words of cheer they arose and continued their journey.
Softly the evening came. The sun from the western horizon
Like a magician extended his golden wand o'er the landscape;
Twinkling vapors arose; and sky and water and forest
Seemed all on fire at the touch, and melted and mingled together.
Hanging between two skies, a cloud with edges of silver,
Floated the boat, with its dripping oars, on the motionless water.
Filled was Evangeline's heart with inexpressible sweetness.
Touched by the magic spell, the sacred fountains of feeling
Glowed with the light of love, as the skies and waters around her.
Then from a neighboring thicket the mocking-bird, wildest of singers,
Swinging aloft on a willow spray that hung o'er the water,
Shook from his little throat such floods of delirious music,
That the whole air and the woods and the waves seemed silent to listen.
Plaintive at first were the tones and sad; then soaring to madness
Seemed they to follow or guide the revel of frenzied Bacchantes.
Single notes were then heard, in sorrowful, low lamentation;
Till, having gathered them all, he flung them abroad in derision,
As when, after a storm, a gust of wind through the tree-tops
Shakes down the rattling rain in a crystal shower on the branches.
With such a prelude as this, and hearts that throbbed with emotion,
Slowly they entered the Têche, where it flows through the green Opelousas,
And, through the amber air, above the crest of the woodland,
Saw the column of smoke that arose from a neighboring dwelling ;
Sounds of a horn they heard, and the distant lowing of cattle.

THE FINDING OF GABRIEL.

Then it came to pass that a pestilence fell on the city,
Presaged by wondrous signs, and mostly by flocks of wild pigeons,
Darkening the sun in their flight, with naught in their craws but an acorn.
And, as the tides of the sea arise in the month of September,
Flooding some silver stream, till it spreads to a lake in the meadow,
So death flooded life, and, o'erflowing its natural margin,
Spread to a brackish lake, the silver stream of existence,
Wealth had no power to bribe, nor beauty to charm, the oppressor;
But all perished alike beneath the scourge of his anger;
Only, alas! the poor, who had neither friends nor attendants,
Crept away to die in the almshouse, home of the homeless.
Then in the suburbs it stood, in the midst of meadows and woodlands;
Now the city surrounds it; but still, with its gateway and wicket
Meek, in the midst of splendor, its humble walls seem to echo
Softly the words of the Lord: "The poor ye always have with you."
Thither, by night and by day, came the Sister of Mercy. The dying
Looked up into her face, and thought, indeed, to behold there
Gleams of celestial light encircle her forehead with splendor,
Such as the artist paints o'er the brows of saints and apostles,
Or such as hangs by night o'er a city seen at a distance.
Unto their eyes it seemed the lamps of the city celestial,
Into whose shining gates ere long their spirits would enter.

Thus, on a Sabbath morn, through the streets, deserted and silent,
Wending her quiet way, she entered the door of the almshouse.
Sweet on the summer air was the odor of flowers in the garden;
And she paused on her way to gather the fairest among them,
That the dying once more might rejoice in their fragrance and beauty.
Then, as she mounted the stairs to the corridors, cooled by the east wind,
Distant and soft on her ear fell the chimes from the belfry of Christ Church,
While, intermingled with these, across the meadows were wafted
Sounds of psalms that were sung by the Swedes in their church at Wicaco,
Soft as descending wings fell the calm of the hour on her spirit;
Something within her said, "At length thy trials are ended;"
And, with light in her looks, she entered the chambers of sickness.

Noiselessly moved about the assiduous, careful attendants,
Moistening the feverish lip and the aching brow, and in silence
Closing the sightless eyes of the dead, and concealing their faces,
Where on their pallets they lay, like drifts of snow by the roadside.
Many a languid head upraised as Evangeline entered,
Turned on its pillow of pain to gaze while she passed, for her presence
Fell on their hearts like a ray of the sun on the walls of a prison.
And, as she looked around, she saw how Death, the consoler,
Laying his hand upon many a heart, had healed it forever.
Many familiar forms had disappeared in the night time;
Vacant their places were, or filled already by strangers.

Suddenly, as if arrested by fear or a feeling of wonder,
Still she stood, with her colorless lips apart, while a shudder
Ran through her frame, and, forgotten, the flowerets dropped from her fingers,
And from her eyes and cheeks the light and bloom of the morning.
Then there escaped from her lips a cry of such terrible anguish,
That the dying heard it, and started up from their pillows.
On the pallet before her was stretched the form of an old man.
Long, and thin, and gray were the locks that shaded his temples;
But, as he lay in the morning light, his face for a moment
Seemed to assume once more the forms of its earlier manhood;
So are wont to be changed the faces of those who are dying.
Hot and red on his lips still burned the flush of the fever,
As if life, like the Hebrew, with blood had besprinkled its portals,
That the Angel of Death might see the sign, and pass over.
Motionless, senseless, dying, he lay, and his spirit exhausted
Seemed to be sinking down through infinite depths in the darkness—
Darkness of slumber and death, forever sinking and sinking.
Then through those realms of shade, in multiplied reverberations,
Heard he that cry of pain, and through the hush that succeeded
Whispered a gentle voice, in accents tender and saint-like,
"Gabriel! O my beloved!" and died away into silence.
Then he beheld, in a dream, once more the home of his childhood;
Green Acadian meadows, with sylvan rivers among them,
Village, and mountain, and woodlands; and, walking under their shadow,
As in the days of her youth, Evangeline rose in his vision.
Tears came into his eyes; and as slowly he lifted his eyelids,
Vanished the vision away, but Evangeline knelt by his bedside.
Vainly he strove to whisper her name, for the accents unuttered
Died on his lips, and their motion revealed what his tongue would have spoken.

Vainly he strove to rise; and Evangeline, kneeling beside him,
Kissed his dying lips, and laid his head on her bosom.
Sweet was the light of his eyes; but it suddenly sank into darkness,
As when a lamp is blown out by a gust of wind at a casement.

All was ended now, the hope, and the fear, and the sorrow,
All the aching of heart, the restless, unsatisfied longing,
All the dull, deep pain, and constant anguish of patience!
And, as she pressed once more the lifeless head to her bosom,
Meekly she bowed her own, and murmured, "Father, I thank Thee!"

It is a curious and interesting circumstance, not generally known to Bostonians now and not known to any of them until, in 1875, when one of Boston's most distinguished and brightest citizens, Edward Everett Hale, published this fact gathered from his own researches, that Boston actually has a patron saint, after whom the city is named—a saint of the Dark Ages, so often discanted upon by New England writers and orators; a saint of the seventh century. This is St. Botolph. "The original name of Botolph's town, given to the town in Lincolnshire in which the noble Church of St. Botolph stands," as stated by Mr. Hale, "has been corrupted to Boston. That name has been brought across the water to this

city; but St. Botolph, whose saint's day in the calendar is June 17, is still the godfather and patron saint of Boston. St. Botolph and St. Adolph were two noble English brothers. They were educated in Belgic Gaul; and Adolph became Bishop of Maestricht. His saint's day is June 17 also. St. Botolph returned to England, where King Ethelmund gave him the wilderness of Ikanho on which he founded an abbey. Here he lived and here he died in the year 655. A part of his relics are at Ely, a part at Thames, a part at Westminster and a part at Peterborough, four parishes in London, and a great many in other parts of England bear his name." It is also mentioned by Mr. Hale "that the great battle (of Bunker's Hill), fought within what are now the limits of Boston, was, by an interesting coincidence, on the saint's day of St. Botolph, whose name Boston bears."

There was another event of annual occurrence throughout New England, and especially in Boston, which is most expressive of the animosity entertained at that time against Catholics and their Church and creed, and a most significant example of the anti-Popery influences under which the subject of our story was reared and educated. Other facts and declarations connected with his life prove that these falsely educational influences had created and nourished a strong prejudice against the Catholic faith and against Catholics in the character of young Thayer. I allude to a most curious custom, during the eighteenth century, in this country, of celebrating what was known as "Pope Day." This discreditable practice prevailed not only in New England, but its annual observance extended southward as far as Georgia.

The celebration of "Pope Day" in New England had its origin in the celebration of "Guy Fawkes' Day" in England. The historic story of Guy Fawkes is too well known to readers of history to need more than a passing mention. In the reign of King James I. Guy Fawkes was the leader of a conspiracy to blow up with gunpowder the King and Parliament, and the conspirators and their leader, altogether few in numbers, though their numbers were greatly exaggerated by the alarm which the attempt created, were deluded and misguided Catholics, who were led to hope that the destruction of the King and the Parliament would release them from the intolerable penal laws under which the English Catholics suffered at that day, or would at least mitigate their sufferings or improve their condition. They are believed by many to have been led on to their own destruction by governmental detectives. The discovery and defeat of the plot and the condign punishment of the conspirators were followed by great outbursts of joy with the whole nation, and resulted in the establishment of a national holiday,

observed annually on the 5th of November, which was called "Guy Fawkes' Day."

But the people of New England had sympathized with Cromwell and the Commonwealth, for it was English Puritans that hurled from his throne and decapitated Charles I., the son of James I. But now the restoration of the royal family of the Stuarts had taken place in the person of Charles II., and the celebration of "Guy Fawkes' Day" was revived in England. Feeling the inconsistency of continuing the celebration of "Guy Fawkes' Day," the New Englanders devised "Pope Day" in its stead, thus avoiding all inconsistencies, while at the same time giving a forcible expression to a hatred of Catholics, a common ground upon which all could consistently stand as from the Protestant standpoint, though from the Mohammedan and Buddhist standpoint there was not much consistency in the hatred of Christians by Christians. Guy Fawkes had failed in the attempt to shed the blood of the Protestant King and Parliament; the Puritan protector and Commonwealth had subsequently reaped an abundant harvest of royal blood and royal victims. The celebration of "Pope Day" as a substitute in New England for "Guy Fawkes' Day" was regarded as a happy method of expressing an anti-Papal sentiment common to all. The same day that had witnessed the celebration of the one was selected for the other, and the same street songs answered the purpose:

Let's always remember
The fiifth of November.

It will be an historical amusement now to recall some of the incidents and methods of celebrating "Pope Day," in which Boston took a leading part. The celebrant rabble prepared an effigy of the Pope, and usually one of the Devil, and these two effigies were made companions on a platform carried by the crowd in procession through the streets amid the liberal discharge of firecrackers and pistols and guns. The platform was mounted on wheels and bore in front a large transparency, on which were inscribed hostile mottoes and sentences expressive of the prevailing feeling and temper. The effigies were made to turn on their feet, to face the houses, gesticulate and amuse the crowd by means of strings carried by boys beside the platform. The procession was headed by a grotesque personage on foot, who constantly rang his bell and loudly bawled out his song, whose refrain was always the same:

Don't you hear my little bell
Go chink, chink, chink?
Please give me a little money,
To buy my Pope some drink.

The residents on the route of the procession were boisterously

called upon to "give a little money" for the expenses of the celebration. Those who refused or hesitated, if a few there were, had their windows broken or their houses battered. Such was the procession that passed through the streets of classic Boston during the eighteenth century. It usually paraded through Boston Common, in front of the State House, and usually wound up at Copp's Hill; and here the effigies were dumped and burned in the bonfire prepared for the purpose. That such a procession should have been, as it was, described by the current newspapers as having been conducted "with great decency and decorum," gives us a poor estimate of the refinement of that day.

But sometimes there were rival and hostile processions with rival and hostile Popes and Devils. It thus turned out on one occasion that the North End of Boston and the South End bristled in hostile array against each other, because of some offense given or imagined by one party against the other. The rival processions met in Union street, fought desperately each to take as prisoners the Pope and the Devil of its opponents. The North Enders, if victorious, would burn the Popes on Copp's Hill, while the South Enders would have them cast into the bonfire blazing on Boston Common.

The celebration of "Pope Day" which took place on November 5, 1745, called for the severe strictures from the New England journals of that day and protests from some of their subscribers. The *Weekly Post-Boy* of November 18, 1745, furnishes us with the following extracts:

Tuesday last being the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot, two Popes were made and carried thro' the streets in the evening, one from the North, the other from the South End of the Town (Boston), attended by a vast number of negroes and white servants, armed with clubs, staves and catlashes, who were very abusive to the Inhabitants, insulting the persons and breaking the windows, etc., of such as did not give them money to their satisfaction, and even many of those who had given them liberally; and the two Popes meeting in Cornhill, their followers were so infatuated as to fall upon each other with the utmost Rage and Fury. Several were sorely wounded and bruised, some left for dead, and rendered incapable of any business for a long time, to the great Loss and Damage of their respective masters.

A letter from one of the subscribers of the *Post-Boy* reads as follows:

I hope you will not suffer the grand fray, not to say bloody, that happen'd before your Door last Tuesday evening to pass off without a public rebuke; and such an one as becomes a person zealous as well for the Peace and Good Order of the State as the Church. What a scandal and Infamy to a Protestant Mob, be it of the rudest and lowest Sailors out of Boston, or even of the very Negroes of the Town, to fall upon one another with Clubs and Catlashes in a Rage and Fury which only Hell could inspire or the Devil broke loose from chains there could represent! Is this a meet or sufferable show of Protestant zeal against Popery? Is this to honor the Protestant religion to the few French prisoners of war that are left among us? Or can our children or servants be safe in the streets at such a time if such Rioters be permitted? Or, in a word, what madness must seize the two mobs, united Brethren, as they would appear against Popery, to fall upon each other, break one another's Bones or dash one another's Brains out?

Why this enormity above all others should be winked at, and the Inhabitants of the Town with their Dwellings left to the mercy of a rude and intoxicated Rabble, the very Dregs of the People, black and white, and why no more has been done to prevent or suppress such Riotous proceedings, which have been long growing upon us, and as long bewailed by all sober persons, must be humbly left to our betters to say.

Ten years later, 1755, other and new companions were given to the effigies of the Pope and Devil, and it became quite common to introduce into the celebration and parade of "Pope Day" other public, political or governmental characters obnoxious to the people or to the politicians of New England—characters which received more especial attention from the rabble than even the Pope or the Devil. Thus the "Pretender," or unpopular or obnoxious English statesman taking part in the enactment of laws in Parliament which the colonies did not like were added; and even as far south as Charleston, South Carolina, we find from contemporary publications that in that city, as late as 1774, Lord North and Governor Hutchinson were joined with the Pope and the Devil on the same platform, and perished in the same bonfire.

In 1755 we have an account from the Annapolis *Gazette* of December 4, in which it is stated that at Boston "the Devil, the Pope and the Pretender at night were carried about the city on a bier, three effigies hideously formed and as humorously contrived, the Devil standing close behind the Pope, seemingly paying his compliments to him, with a three-pronged pitchfork in one hand, with which at times he was made to thrust His Holiness on the back, and a hawthorn in the other, the young Pretender standing before the Pope, waiting his commands."

"In their route," continues the Annapolis *Gazette*, "through the streets they stopped at the French General's lodgings (General Dieskau, who was then lying wounded and a prisoner in Boston), where a guard was ordered to prevent mischief by the mob. The General sent down some silver by the carriers, with which, after giving three huzzas, they marched off to a proper place and set fire to the Devil's tail, burning the three to cinders."

During our Revolutionary War the celebration of "Pope Day," after an interval, was again revived. This revival of a discreditable custom is attributable to the passage by the British Parliament of what is generally known as the "Quebec Act," by which England in good faith guaranteed to the Catholics of Canada and of the Territories northwest of the Ohio the free exercise of their religion as fully as they enjoyed it before the conquest by England and the cession of those countries by France to England. In 1774 we hear of "Pope Day" again at Newburyport, Massachusetts, as appears from the following account taken from the "History of Newburyport:"

The last public celebration of "Pope Day," so-called in Newbury and Newburyport (Mass.), occurred this year. To prevent any tumult or disorder taking place during the evening or night, the town of Newburyport voted, October 24, 1774, "that no effigies be carried about or exhibited on the 5th of November, only in the daytime." Motives of policy afterwards induced the discontinuance of this custom, which has now become obsolete. This year (1774) the celebration went off with a great flourish. In the daytime companies of little boys might be seen in various parts of the town, with their little popes dressed up in the most grotesque and fantastic manner, which they carried about, some on boards and some on little carriages, for their own and others' amusement. But the great exhibition was reserved for the night, in which young men as well as boys participated. They first constructed a huge vehicle, varying at times from 20 to 40 feet long, 8 or 10 wide and 5 or 6 high, from the lower to the upper platform, on the front of which they erected a paper lantern, capacious enough to hold, in addition to the lights, five or six persons. Behind that as large as life sat the mimic Pope and several other personages, monks, friars, and so forth. Last but not least stood an image of what was designed to be a representation of old Nick himself, furnished with a pair of huge horns, holding in his hands a pitchfork and otherwise accoutred with all the frightful ugliness that their ingenuity could devise. Their next step after they had mounted their ponderous vehicle on four wheels, chosen their officers, captain, first and second lieutenants, purser, and so forth, placed a boy under the platform to elevate and move around at proper intervals the movable head of the Pope.

The celebration also took place this year in Boston, where two rival mobs and processions united in the festival, and they carried what they called a "Union Pope" in their combined procession.

And from the New York *Journal* of December 15, 1774, we learn that the revived celebration of "Pope Day" was vigorously observed, and the effigies of the Pope and the Devil had as companions on the platform other distinguished personages, one from England and another a Colonial Governor: "We had great diversion the 5th instant in seeing the effigies of Lord North, Governor Hutchinson, the Pope and the Devil, which were erected on a moving machine and after having been paraded about the town all day, they were in the evening burnt on the Common with a large bonfire, attended by a numerous crowd of people."

But now the good influences were at work and the providential man was at hand,

Arma virumque cano,

whereby this odious celebration was to be brought to an ignominious end. While the revived celebrations in different parts of the country, following the enactment of the "Quebec Act," were quite generally observed and were marked by great enthusiasm, the days of religious intolerance were ended and the days also of religious liberty and equality were at hand. The year 1774 had now witnessed the last of "Pope Day" celebrations, but not the last attempt.

The year 1775, the year preceding the Declaration of Independence, saw the thirteen American colonies in actual war with the mother country in defense of rights and liberties guaranteed to all Englishmen and to all the English colonies by Magna Charta and by the British Constitution. Now for the first time Catholics and

Protestants were marching to the music of the Union. George Washington was Commander-in-Chief and was then at the head of the American army, encamped at Boston, and in that gallant army were many Catholic soldiers and patriots from Maryland and Pennsylvania. Thoughtless of this fact, the fanatic mob proposed and had issued calls for the celebration of "Pope Day" on the 5th of November, 1775, and there were New England officers and soldiers in Washington's army who were more or less in the scheme. From the headquarters of the army Washington issued the following order of the day, which is to be found in his published works and which happily put an end forever to this celebration of "Pope Day" throughout the United States:*

November 5.—As the commander-in-chief has been apprised of a design formed for the observance of that ridiculous and childish custom of burning the effigy of the Pope, he cannot help expressing his surprise that there should be officers and soldiers in this army so void of common sense as not to see the impropriety of such a step at this juncture; at a time when we are soliciting and have already obtained the friendship and alliance of the people of Canada, whom we ought to consider as brethren embarked in the same cause—the defense of the Liberty of America. At this juncture and under such circumstances to be insulting their religion is so monstrous as not to be suffered or excused; indeed, instead of offering the most remote insult, it is our duty to express public thanks to these our brethren, as to them we are indebted for every late happy success over the common enemy in Canada.

Boston has frequently been called the Athens of America, a distinction which she has well merited, but one to which she has become chiefly but not wholly entitled since she passed from the colonial status to that of American Statehood. But even before this change that beautiful and cultivated city bore a resemblance to Athens, where the education of the people did not take place mostly in such schools, academies and colleges as are known to our modern life. Athenian education was rather in the public assemblies, the Olympic and other games, the temples, the oracles and in that unique Athenian institution, the Public Academy, the garden or villa of Plato. Even Harvard was either a guide or a reflex of public opinion. To a boy of John Thayer's temperament and idle youth, the streets of Boston were likewise the principal sources, besides his father's house, of all he learned of history, or of Rome, or of the Pope, or of the ancient faith of Christendom. We do not know the fact, but he may have been one of the idle boys that pulled the strings connected with the effigies on "Pope Day." We cannot doubt of his having seen the processions, nor of the impressions his mind and character received therefrom. But even "Pope Day"

*Many of the details of this account of "Pope Day" have been derived from Dr. John Gilmary Shea's article in the *United States Catholic Historical Magazine* of January, 1888, in which are cited as authorities the *Weekly Post*, November 18, 1745; *Annapolis Gazette*, December 4, 1755; "History of Newburyport," page 249, and *New York Journal*, December 15, 1774.

left much good in his life and character, as it has left Boston to become one of the model Catholic cities of America.

In 1791 Bishop Carroll visited Boston, and after his return to Baltimore thus gave his impressions of the place, of its hospitality and of its more moderate feelings towards Catholics: "It is wonderful to tell what great civilities have been done to me in this town, where a few years ago a Popish priest was thought to be the greatest monster in creation. Many here, even of their principal people, have acknowledged to me that they would have crossed to the opposite side of the street rather than meet a Roman Catholic, some time ago. The horror which was associated with the idea of a Papist is incredible; and the scandalous misrepresentations by their ministers increased the horror every Sunday."

With such experiences of Boston in 1791, what would be the impressions of Archbishop Carroll if he could now, in 1903, see that same good city with its Catholic Archbishop and Auxiliary Bishop, the metropolitan see of a Catholic ecclesiastical province containing in New England an archdiocese and six suffragan dioceses with their Bishops, priests, churches and institutions; while the Archdiocese of Boston itself contains about four hundred and fifty Catholic priests, over seven hundred churches, one hundred and fifty religious and teaching Brothers, sixteen hundred religious and teaching Sisters, a diocesan seminary, with nearly one hundred students aspiring to the same ministry that Father Thayer embraced over a hundred years ago, three Catholic colleges, with about four hundred and fifty students, seventy-five parochial schools, with nearly forty-five thousand pupils, eight female academies, with nearly one thousand girls trained to higher education, and with orphan asylum, school for deaf mutes, hospitals and homes, with nearly nine hundred resident patients and over fifty-five thousand three hundred outpatients, nearly forty-nine young persons under Catholic care and a Catholic population exceeding six hundred and fifty thousand?

What would be his surprise at learning that the city of Boston was now ruled by a Catholic Mayor, whose administration was so correct and beneficial that he was re-elected by the free choice of a majority of the whole population of the city, after having represented Boston for several terms in the National House of Representatives?

May it not also interest the citizens of the noble city of Boston, with all its Puritan traditions, to know now what few of them may be aware of, that Boston itself bears the very name of a Catholic saint?

Trained under such influences from his childhood, young John

Thayer, then a Congregational minister, left home with no sympathies for the Catholic Church, and his conversion cannot be regarded in any other light than as a special Providence conveying supernatural grace to his soul. His only companion on this interesting voyage was his angel guardian, true guardian of his soul.

He arrived in France towards the end of 1781 and spent ten months there studying the language, reading the best French authors and acquainting himself with the government and national characteristics and manners of the people. A severe illness overtook him while here, and he says of himself, in alluding to it: "My first concern was to forbid that any Catholic priest be suffered to come near me, such was my attachment to my own sect." He next spent three months in England, and made a careful study of the English Government and people. In England he accepted an invitation to preach in an English Protestant church, and when it was remarked that his doctrines did not agree with those of his hearers, members of the English Church, he replied: "I have taken them from the Bible."

Thence again passing through France, he visited Rome and continued there, as in France and England, to study the government and the people. At this time the infidel philosophy of the French Revolution was fashionable in all other parts of Europe, and all classes were paying homage to the memory and principles of Voltaire and Rousseau, then recently deceased. At Rome everything was Papal and Catholic, and he studied the religion of Rome as he would have studied that of Mahomet at Constantinople, or of Buddha in India. His residence in France had removed partially or slightly some of his prejudices against Catholicity; now the gentle manners and cordial reception of the Italians, contrasting as they did with his Puritan reserve, pleased him much. Without doubting his own faith he studied Catholicity for information. At Rome a priest startled him by suggesting that he would say the Lord's Prayer for light and grace, but he gently though doubtingly complied. Gradually, but slowly, his mind became convinced that his own was not the true religion, and still more slowly he began to see reason and truth in the Catholic faith. Yet he resolved not to become a Catholic. Even after his mind became convinced he resolved not to make an abjuration in Rome, for fear of precipitate action, but to delay and consider. At this time a beautiful book on the Angel Guardian deeply impressed him. The Angel Guardian was now quickening his steps.

While he was in Rome the event of a century took place. The holy Benedict Joseph Labre died, and his life, virtues, poverty and miracles were the topics of universal admiration and wonder. Some

scoffed, while many venerated his life. A young Frenchman of good education had been led to leave home, and in the spirit of penance had adopted the life of a poor pilgrim and ragged mendicant. In our day he would have been driven from every door as a tramp. He had lived several years in Rome, and had become universally known as "the holy beggar." His death occurred on Holy Wednesday, 1783, and a sudden and startling rumor spread through Rome that a saint had died. There was an atmosphere of awe pervading the Eternal City. Before and after his funeral the church where his remains were deposited was so thronged with pious people that soldiers had to guard his tomb. Eighty thousand small pieces of the rags which had but partially covered the holy beggar's person were distributed among the good people of the city. His fame extended to every continent, and many miracles were wrought on the application of his relics or on invoking his intercession.

Our young Puritan was at first repelled by this extraordinary and to him distasteful spectacle; he could not, however, refrain from thoroughly investigating the matter. He saw "the holy beggar's" confessor, and visited four persons said to have been miraculously cured. He became, after calm and long continued investigation, convinced of the extraordinary virtues of the deceased saint, and of the truth of the alleged miracles as stated by Dr. John Gilmary Shea: "He joined others in ridiculing the miracles of Labre till, it is said, a gentleman challenged him to go and investigate some of the cases. He did so, and to his astonishment found the evidence such as would have decided a case in any court of justice."

Providentially a little book, in which another convert gave an account of his conversion, fell into his hands, and was earnestly read. He now began to say constantly the beautiful prayer for light, which is familiar to our readers from its uniform publication in the prayer books in common use in this country. As usual, after all other difficulties were overcome, there loomed up in his mind his family and their apprehended displeasure; his being a Protestant minister and having for years preached Protestantism, and a thousand other social and temporal aspects of the situation and the dreaded change. But he could not refrain from reading and praying. As usual, great agitation of mind came on, then tears in abundance, and next followed his conversion, when he exclaimed: "My God, I promise to become a Catholic!"

The two following passages are from Father Fitton's "History of the Catholic Church in New England:"

Mr. Thayer had nourished a bitter prejudice against Catholicity and the nations who professed it; hence the Italians were to him objects of holy horror, his prepossessed mind viewing them in the most odious light, as

the most superstitious of men. However, he must see Rome, that great metropolis of the arts; he must visit the tombs of Virgil and Dante; he must drink at that living fountain of letters and science. In his passage from Marseilles to Rome he was obliged to remain several days in a small harbor called Port Creolé. The Marquis d'Elmoro, Mayor of the place, received him with fraternal affection and kindness, though a perfect stranger. His house, his table, his library, all were at his service. At his departure he made him promise to keep a continued correspondence with him. Mr. Thayer, in the account of his conversion, to which we have alluded and from which we glean these facts, tells us that he afterwards met with many Italians whose kindness and cordiality towards a stranger and a Protestant dispelled the bitterness of his early prejudice and prepared his soul to receive the light. As soon as he entered Rome his first desire was to visit the principal monuments of antiquity which are attractive to strangers. The Rotunda or Pantheon, a temple formerly consecrated to the worship of all the heathen deities, and now dedicated to the One God, under the invocation of the Virgin Mother and all the saints, was in an especial manner the object of his admiration. While he regretted that the superstitions of Catholics should have entered it, the sublime thought of elevating the Crucified over the idols of the nations and establishing the empire of God on the ruins of the kingdom of the "strong one armed" seemed to him to be truly heavenly, and in the fervor of his heart he prayed for the benighted men who knew not the true gospel of Christ and remained plunged in the darkness of former errors.

He had of the Jesuits the opinion entertained by many Protestants, deeming them men of deep cunning, political craft and subtle reasoning. He had never seen a member of the Socity of Jesus, and knew the Jesuits but from the calumnies of their enemies. While visiting some of the public monuments he met two ecclesiastics whose simplicity and conversational charms pleased him exceedingly, and great was his astonishment when they told him they were Jesuits. The Catholic religion was soon introduced as the subject of their conversation by Mr. Thayer himself, who wished to acquire some knowledge of it, as he would have desired to learn what were the tenets of Mahometanism had he been in Constantinople. The examination of the dogmas of the Catholic Church was long and serious; considering, on the one hand, that unerring sameness through the ages of the Church of Rome, on the other, the wavering instability of all the Protestant sects, he became convinced that Protestantism was not the religion of Jesus Christ.

He had consulted Jesuits, Augustinians, Roman doctors and a great number of others, and his inquiries, doubts and difficulties, his earnestness, his prayers and his blunt Puritan honesty had attracted much interest to his case. Time and space prevent our going into greater details; but the Blessed Virgin, whose intercession he invoked, joined hands with the Angel Guardian, and these finally led him by the hand into the one fold.

He was received into the Church on May 25, 1783, at Rome.

His case created much interest and sympathy. The Holy Father gave him several interviews, and bestowed upon him a crucifix, which Father Thayer always preserved and greatly prized through life. He wrote and published in 1787, after his conversion and his return to Boston, a very brief account, which gives the steps and investigations, the trials and consolations through which he passed in his journey from Puritanism to Catholicity. The "holy beggar," whose taggard relics were eagerly sought in 1783 at Rome, was canonized on December 8, 1881, and he is now St. Benedict Joseph Labre.

It is quite an interesting circumstance that the fame of "the holy beggar," Benedict Joseph Labre, was spread through many Catholic lands even before his death, and more especially at the signal

moment of his saintly death at Rome. In Catholic Maryland the fame of the future canonized saint was so great that many children coming into the world before or at or about the time of his death received the name of Benedict Joseph. The present writer has known in his own family connection several such cases, which show that these two joint names, first bestowed about 1783, had become family names among the descendants of those who were the first to bear the name of Benedict Joseph. Having mentioned that the saint's fame had spread in many lands even in his lifetime, I will mention the case of Benedict Joseph Fenwick, who was born in Maryland the year before the saint's death, and while his reputation was far and near, and who providentially afterwards became the second Bishop of Boston, and became somewhat identified with the life and labors of Father Thayer, derived his name from this source and in honor of "the holy beggar."

The history of his own conversion, interesting, though limited and imperfect as a whole, was written by Father Thayer, at the request of many, in English and French. It was translated into several languages, in Baltimore in 1788, in Hartford in 1790, in Spain and other countries, and was reproduced in the *Ave Maria*, of Notre Dame, Indiana, in the numbers of June 23 and 30, 1883. It was also published in Dublin in 1809. Rev. Mr. Nagot included the "Account of the conversion of the Rev. John Thayer, lately a Protestant minister at Boston, in North America," published apparently at London in 1787, and in France at Paris in his "Recueil de Conversions Remarquable nouvellement operées dans quelques Protestans," published at Paris 1790. It was also published in Spanish and in Canada.

We are now able to give a more comprehensive history of his life in the light of aftermath and its good results.

Father Thayer returned to France. He was by vocation a preacher, a missionary, a champion of religion. Being now a layman, he sought in the Church, through Holy Orders, the authentic mission of the apostles. He entered the College of Navarre and was received by the Archbishop of that see into the Institution for Recent Converts. Confirmed in his desire for Holy Orders he next entered the Seminary of St. Sulpice, where he met and enjoyed the counsel and direction of Rev. Mr. Nagot, the superior of St. Sulpice, who afterwards led the Sulpicians to America and founded St. Mary's Seminary at Baltimore, where he spent the remainder of his life in rearing priests for the American mission. Father Nagot saw and admired the zeal and devotion of his pupil and took a deep interest in his welfare. To some extent Father Thayer imitated the example of St. Benedict Joseph Labre. He spent his vacations

from the seminary in pilgrimages; he made a pilgrimage to La Trappe, where he spent a considerable time. He was, however, too fond of preaching to seek the permanent companionship of the austere and silent Trappists. He also made a pilgrimage to Amath, the home of St. Benedict Joseph Labre, whom he also imitated by traveling on foot and entering the churches and shrines on the wayside to pray and to receive the Blessed Sacrament. Indeed he was sometimes taken for a "holy beggar" himself, for not unfrequently he was refused Holy Communion by parish priests, who suspected him of being what we now call a tramp or adventurer. And yet during these days of humble preparation for the sacred ministry he did not lose sight entirely of the world nor of his Boston friends. While at St. Sulpice he paid a visit to John Adams, the representative patriot of Boston, then with his family at Anteuil, as mentioned by Mrs. Adams in a letter of January 18, 1785, to Rev. John Shaw. After a course of three years ecclesiastical studies he was ordained in the Catholic priesthood by the Archbishop of Paris, in 1787, for the American missions. He of course was most anxious to return to his own home and labor for the conversion of his countrymen to the true faith which had been vouchsafed to him. He thus expressed his feelings in the history of his conversion:

> This is the prevailing wish, this is the only desire of my heart to extend as much as lies in my power the dominion of the true faith which is now my joy and comfort. I desire nothing more; for this purpose I wish to return to my own country, in hopes, notwithstanding my unworthiness, to be the instrument of the conversion of my countrymen; and such is my conviction of the truth of the Catholic Church and my gratitude for the signal grace of being called to the true faith that I would willingly seal it with my blood, if God grant me this favor, and I doubt not but He would enable me to do it.
>
> I entreat all those who shall peruse this narrative to pray with fervor to the Father of lights and God of mercies to bless the designs of His unworthy servants, and to open an easy access to the faith in my country and to cause it to shoot forth and fructify in a land in which it has been as yet imperfectly known. Perhaps—and I dwell with pleasure on the consoling thought —perhaps, I say, He who raises up and casts down empires as He pleases, who does all for His elect and for the interest of His Church, has only permitted and brought to an end the surprising Revolution (the independence of the United States) of which we have been witnesses in order to accomplish some great design and much more happy revolution in the order of grace. Amen.

At this day such words seem truly prophetic. At the time these lines were written the Catholic population of the United States was estimated at about twenty-five thousand. There were twenty-four priests, no Bishop had been appointed and the infant American Church was governed by Very Rev. John Carroll as Prefect-Apostolic. Father Thayer did not return to the United States until after a Bishop was appointed in the person of Dr. Carroll, but in the meantime he awaited orders from him as Prefect-Apostolic. During this delay Father Thayer employed himself in the most ardent, humble and successful missionary labors, first among the English in London and in Paris, and then again in London, where he used

for his chapel an old factory in the poorest part of the city. He succeeded by his zeal, piety, good example and familiarity with Catholic dogmas, a field which he had so recently and so successfully gone over himself, in converting many Protestants.

Dr. Carroll having been appointed first Bishop of Baltimore in 1790, Father Thayer returned to America in that year. After a voyage of eleven weeks he arrived in Baltimore in February of that year, and was most kindly received by Bishop Carroll, with whom he soon afterwards traveled to Philadelphia, and thence proceeded to his native city, Boston, where he was appointed by the Bishop pastor of the only Catholic church, the membership of which numbered sixty souls.

The Church in Boston had had only misfortune. In 1788 Dr. Carroll, then Prefect-Apostolic, had given faculties to Rev. Claudius Florent Bouchand de la Poterie, a priest from the Diocese of Angers, who, however, soon began to disclose his real character by announcing his advent to Boston in a presumptuous and printed "Pastoral Letter," in which he announced himself by a multitude of pompous titles.

The French Hugenots had preceded the Catholics in Boston by obtaining a church in School street, the title of which by the deeds of conveyance could only be vested in Frenchmen. This church was obtained by the Abbé de la Poterie for the Catholics of Boston and dedicated on All Saints' Day, in honor of the Holy Cross. This dedication has given to the Archdiocese of Boston a traditional devotion to the Holy Cross, as witnessed by the title born by the next built church in Boston, which was the Cathedral of its first Bishops, and by the title of the present magnificent Cathedral of the Holy Cross, and by the title of the College of the Holy Cross at Worcester, which at the time of its foundation was in the Diocese of Boston. Abbé de la Poterie, who was a man of address and education, succeeded in obtaining subscriptions to the new church in New England and also in Canada, and the Archbishop of Paris, on the request of this sparse and poor congregation, donated to the church an outfit of sacred vessels, vestments and other ecclesiastical articles. The first note of alarm came from this prelate, who informed the Catholics of Boston that de la Poterie's faculties had been withdrawn from him at Paris on account of his misconduct. Dr. Carroll in the meantime received tidings of him as an unworthy priest at Paris, Naples and Rome. Rev. William O'Brien, the Dominican, of New York, was sent to Boston by Dr. Carroll to withdraw the faculties of de la Potiere, who before his departure for Canada issued an abusive pamphlet against the Prefect-Apostolic and Father O'Brien entitled "The Resurrection of Laurent Ricci."

At the time of Father Thayer's advent to Boston the Rev. Louis Rousselet was there as pastor, and he had proved to be no improvement on his predecessor. Father Thayer was not long in discovering Rousselet's conduct to be scandalous; his faculties were withdrawn by Dr. Carroll, and he departed after some time for Gaudeloupe. Captured by the French, he with many of his countrymen afterwards perished by the guillotine in France. But it must be said in his favor that at this extreme hour his faith sustained him; he appealed to the consciences of his fellow-prisoners, and heard their confessions. Yet he said: "But as for me, I must go into eternity without having the efficacious graces of the sacraments applied to my poor soul."

Colonel B. U. Campbell, in his articles on "The Early History of the Catholic Church," speaking of Boston, says: "Many of his fellow-prisoners embraced the opportunity, made their confessions to Rousselet and together with the poor penitential priest were launched into eternity."

At the time of Rouselet's appointment Dr. Carroll expected Father Thayer, and intended to appoint him to assist Rousselet and finally to make him pastor at Boston. In one of his letters Bishop Carroll writes: "Mr. Thayer will have much to do to repair the scandals committed by this man," alluding to Abbé de la Poterie. But Father Thayer had to repair by his good example the scandals of both Poterie and Rousselet. The following account of Father Thayer's reception at Boston is from a letter of his own dated at

Boston, July 17, 1790.

I reached Boston on the 4th of January last, and have everywhere been received with the most flattering attention. My own relatives expressed the greatest joy at my return. The Governor of the State, whose chaplain I formerly was, has promised to do all in his power to forward my views and favor the work for which I have been sent to Boston. I have received nothing but kindness and attention from the ministers of the town. Many of them have visited me and evinced a degree of cordiality which I had little reason to expect. The officers of the custom house have also carried their politeness so far as to be unwilling to take anything for the many large boxes which I had procured from France and England, having looked upon their contents as things designed for sacred purposes.

On the first Sunday after my arrival I announced the word of God, and all flocked in crowds to hear me. A great degree of curiosity is manifested to become acquainted with our belief, and the free toleration allowed here has enabled me to enter into a full exposition of it. But I was not long in a position to satisfy the curiosity of the people of Boston. I had been only a fortnight in the town when it pleased Almighty God to afflict me with a sickness that kept me confined to my bed for a month. The danger appeared to be so serious on one occasion that I requested the Holy Viaticum of a French clergyman with whom I am associated in the work of the Lord and His Church. My health was restored by degrees, and as soon as I had recovered sufficient strength I availed myself of the privilege allowed me to celebrate Mass in my chamber. When my health was sufficiently restored, I resumed my functions of preaching, confessing and visiting the few sheep that composed our little flock.

On every occasion the Protestants evinced the same eagerness to come and hear me; but they contented themselves with that. The indifference and philosophy which prevail here, as much as anywhere else, are an obstacle to the fruit of preaching which it is exceedingly difficult to remove—an obstacle, however, which does not in the least discourage me.

I have had the pleasure of receiving a few recantations, and our dear

neophytes afford me great consolation by the sanctity of their life. About one hundred Catholics, consisting of French, Irishmen and Americans, are what constitute at present our Church. About one dozen of them can attend Mass daily. I am engaged in instructing a few Protestants whom I hope to restore shortly to our common Mother. I recommend our mission most earnestly to your prayers. We are in want of laborers for the cultivation of the immense field which has been so long abandoned in the United States.

THAYER.

Father Thayer was the third pastor of the Church of the Holy Cross at Boston. His zeal was unbounded. His devotion to every duty was untiring, and he never confined himself to mere routine duty, for this does not make a real priest of God. He set no bounds to his labors. Scarcely had he been in Boston three weeks when he published in one of the newspapers that he would preach on the evenings of the week in any of the neighboring towns, and announcing his readiness to answer the objections any gentleman would wish to make, either publicly or privately, to the doctrines he preached. The following was Father Thayer's published announcement:

Mr. Thayer, Catholic priest of Boston, fully persuaded that he has found the inestimable treasure of the Gospels, is greatly desirous of imparting it to his dear countrymen. For this purpose he offers to preach on the evenings of the weekdays in any of the neighboring towns. If any persons desire to hear the exposition of the Catholic faith—of which the majority of Americans have so mistaken an idea—and will furnish any place for the accommodaton of hearers, Mr. Thayer will be ever ready to attend them. He will also undertake to answer the objections any gentleman would wish to make, either publicly or privately, to the doctrine he preaches.

Father Thayer publicly declared:

It is no vain presumption on my own learning and abilities that prompts me to this step; my only motive is the glory of God in the salvation of poor souls. My entire trust is in the strength of my Redeemer and the goodness of my cause.

Soon after the publication of this notice Rev. George Leslie, the Congregational minister of the church at Washington, New Hampshire, interpreting it as a challenge, came forward in behalf of the clergy of New England and made answer thereto, almost in the style of ancient knights at their tournaments, as follows: "As the gauntlet is thrown down by Mr. Thayer, it is taken up by George Leslie."

These discussions were printed under the title of "Controversy Between Rev. John Thayer, Catholic Missionary at Boston, and the Rev. George Leslie, Pastor of a Church in Washington, New Hampshire. To which are added several other pieces."

Mr. Leslie commenced the discussion of the question of the infallibility of the Church, to which he stated his objections. The Catholic champion answered in an argument characterized at once by able arguments and good temper; but his antagonist never returned to the charge. Many other antagonists entered the field, and, although their attacks were marked by coarseness and bitter raillery, Father Thayer replied to them all with ability, dignity and charity. Next a prominent lawyer, Mr. John Gardner, who, forgetting his

legal training, indulged in abuse rather than argument—a sure sign of a weak cause, for it is a proverb among lawyers that when an advocate has a bad cause before the court and jury, he is sure to commence abusing his adversary's client. To this tirade of Mr. Gardner the Catholic pastor responded in a truly scholarly and Christian style. His adversaries were silenced. But he continued his controversial lectures twice a week in his little church on School street, to which he invited all lovers of truth and seekers after salvation. The little church now became crowded by the best citizens of Boston, attracted either by curiosity to hear their late colleague and co-religionist, now gone over to Rome, or through a desire for information. The congregation at this time was estimated at one hundred and twenty-five souls; so increased under Father Thayer from sixty. From obscurity the little church became a noted place of attraction, and Father Thayer became a lion among the dwellers in the Beacon street of that day. All respected his sincerity, his ability and his Christian deportment. The little Catholic body grew in the esteem and respect of the whole community of Boston.

Father Thayer never relaxed his labors, his mortifications, penances and austerities. He said Mass every day, frequently preached, was constant in the confessional, catechised the children, visited the sick and administered the sacraments.

Not only did Protestants take interest in his lectures; lukewarm Catholics in that little flock now became zealous. His evening lectures rewarded his zeal with consoling results. He made a practice of visiting adjacent towns and villages to carry the consolations of religion to any Catholics he might find and to announce the faith to the Puritans. Although he did not make in the rural districts any signal conversions, he allayed much prejudice. In Boston he made many converts, and the congregation of the Holy Cross continued greatly to increase. After the faculties had been withdrawn from the unworthy pastor, Rousselet, he tarried some time in Boston and opened an opposition church, was followed by some of the French members of the congregation of the Holy Cross, and Father Thayer had to endure the sorrow of seeing his little flock disunited. So grave were the difficulties of the situation that Bishop Carroll visited Boston in May, 1791, and did much by his wisdom and prudence towards healing the disasters of the Church of Boston. We have already quoted the Bishop's impressions of Boston at this time. I will add here the interesting circumstance that Dr. Carroll accepted the invitation to their annual dinner celebration of "The Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company" of Boston, at which he pronounced the thanksgiving at the end of the banquet. This was

the same Ancient Military Company that recently in 1903 invited and received as their guests "The Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company" of London, which attracted much admiration in Boston, New York and Washington and were received by the President at the capital.

Both church factions united in recognizing Father Thayer as their pastor. Arrangements were made under the Bishop's prudent guidance for paying off the church debts, even those of the opposition and including some debts contracted by the Abbé de la Poterie, and regulations were made for renting the pews of the church, the best one being reserved for the French Consul. The success of Father Thayer's noble efforts were somewhat defeated by the scandals of his two predecessors. The work of the little missionary church was also embarrassed by his own inexperience in business and in handling a congregation.

Father Thayer in November, 1791, attended the first Diocesan Synod of Baltimore, which was composed of all the priests in the United States, who were very few in number. How strange it would seem to a Boston priest of this day, when three metropolitan sees and their suffragan dioceses exist north of Baltimore, to receive a summons to a diocesan synod at Baltimore! Bishop Carroll now associated the good and noble Abbé Matignon with Father Thayer at the church in Boston, for the latter's impetuous zeal, outspoken language, quaint manners and inexperience scarcely fitted him for the management of a congregation. We have no accounts of the effect this movement had upon him, but in 1794 he was stationed at Alexandria, Virginia. But he was unhappy there, chiefly owing to his inability to reconcile himself with the institution of slavery; and in 1796 Father Thayer visited New York, where a hundred and twenty-one members of St. Peter's congregation signed a petition to Bishop Carroll for his appointment as assistant to Father O'Brien. However, Father O'Brien was unwilling to have as his assistant one of such marked peculiarity of views and methods, and Bishop Carroll was unwilling to force upon the pastor of St. Peter's an unacceptable assistant. Father Thayer was not a parish priest by vocation, temperament, training or habit; he was an exceptional personage, suited for good and great efforts and noble results, not in the way of the world, but in the way of the Cross. His saintly character, with its idiosyncrasies, perhaps eccentricities, did not harmonize with men of the world. His life was always more or less flavored with the methods and manners of St. Benedict Joseph Labre, and also with his sanctity, but this in the saint, had he been a priest, would not have harmonized with the human side of the Church, and did not so harmonize in the case of Father Thayer. Discouraged at his ill

success at parochial service, Father Thayer asked permission to retire from the diocese, which was co-extensive with the whole United States at that time. Bishop Carroll, knowing and appreciating his virtues and his services to religion, reluctantly consented. But the zealous priest then went, with Bishop Carroll's consent, to Kentucky to assist the celebrated missionary of that State, Father Badin, and here he labored for two years in the missions of Kentucky. But in Kentucky Father Thayer encountered the same difficulties; he could not accommodate himself to regular parochial work nor to the institution of slavery, and his eccentric methods of life did not accord with the severe views of Father Badin. Bishop Carroll then, finding no other course to adopt, advised him to leave Kentucky.

Father Thayer was the first native of this country that exercised the holy ministry in the State of Kentucky. Of the four years he spent in that State only two were devoted to the active duties of the ministry. His colleagues in the priesthood condemned "his intemperance of speech;" his life was eminently irreproachable, and "in London and Limerick he was revered as an apostle." Great as may have been the difficulties his fellow priests found in living or working with him, there is a place for such men in the great economies of Providence and in coöperation for the special interests of religion and of the Church. This was illustrated in the subsequent success of Father Thayer in originating the movement for founding the beautiful and useful Order of the Ursulines in New England, a great work of exalted zeal, in the prosecution of which the ridicule or criticism of his opponents never caused him to falter. In 1803 Father Thayer, with Archbishop Carroll's consent, left Kentucky, and in the same year sailed for Europe, realizing, as Archbishop Spalding said, "that no prophet is received in his own country." But Father Thayer was received as an apostle in other lands than his own.

Before leaving America Father Thayer announced his intention of undertaking the founding of a community of religious ladies in the United States. He spent four years preaching in London, and from 1803 to 1809, in which latter year we trace him at Dublin, he was no doubt zealously engaged in making collections for the religious foundation in America. In 1811 he took up his residence permanently in Limerick, where he spent the remainder of his life, which was justly regarded as that of a saint and where it was universally said that he died in the odor of sanctity. He had no parish in Limerick, though it is supposed that he went there under the patronage of Right Rev. Bishop Young. Here he devoted his life to the good work; he preached, as before, controversial sermons,

taught catechism to the children, visited the sick, heard confessions, and not a few of the children whom he instructed there afterwards became useful priests of the Irish Church. His labors were chiefly at St. Michael's and St. John's, where his controversial sermons did much good in a community in which in those days such sermons were much needed, for very many people were giving up their faith, being wearied out with persecution or obscurity; for this was before Catholic Emancipation. He heard confessions every day at St. Michael's from seven until eleven, fasting, and then said Mass. He then took his only daily meal, keeping a perpetual fast, and never ate either meat or eggs. During his frugal repast one of the students from Park College would read to him by permission of the Bishop, in order that he might lose no time. He never allowed a fire in his room, nor sat by one. At night he used to take a little dry bread and one glass of wine. He heard confessions nearly all day, and when the churches were closed he continued to hear confessions in certain houses and especially at his own lodgings. It is said that when he first went to Limerick not only was faith weakening, but confessions were rare, except at Easter, and he, by his sermons and spiritual counsels, induced many to confess monthly and others more frequently. He had a great number of penitents, and so remarkable were they for their piety and exemplary lives that they were called "Thayerites," as the Irish Redemptorist, Father Bridgett, writes, "by those who did not relish a piety superior to their own." He had about two hundred of his penitents to make their meditations daily, and they never failed in this. He was devoted to the poor; he was not only their benefactor, he was their companion, their brother. "He had learned this from Blessed Benedict Joseph." His patrimony he had long since given to the poor, and shortly before his death he sold his watch in order to relieve the poor. He died so poor himself that he left not a penny towards purchasing for himself a grave, a circumstance that astonished a people, one of whose pecularities is to stint themselves in life in order to provide for themselves in death "a decent funeral," by which, of course, they meant a truly Catholic one.

Father Thayer having, with the approbation of Bishop Carroll, gone to Europe with the view of introducing a female religious community into Boston, Bishop Fenwick, second Bishop of Boston, himself named Benedict Joseph, in honor of the sainted Labre, as was then the custom in Catholic Maryland at the time of and for many years before and after his death, writes in his memoirs: "The plan was at this time ridiculed by some, laughed at by others and even the most friendly to the undertaking thought it never could

succeed. Father Thayer heeded not the inconsiderate language and views of some of his late colleagues in the American mission, but persevered with unbounded zeal."

At Limerick, "in order to lead them (the Catholics of Limerick) more effectually to God, Father Thayer endeavored to make himself all to all, and formed a kind friendship and social intercourse with several families whose children he enlightened with higher views of piety, leading them to the practice of meditation and frequent communion." His lodgings were first over the shop of a Mr. Bourke, the glover, in Patrick street, and afterwards over the store at Messrs. Ryan Brothers, cloth merchants, at the sign of the Golden Eagle, in Patrick, opposite Allen street. He visited many families and instilled piety into the inmates wherever he went. We will soon see that his residence with the Ryan Brothers led to important results for the American Church.

By his personal exertions and labors Father Thayer accumulated between eight and ten thousand dollars towards founding the projected religious community at Boston, a purpose he always kept in view and which was only interrupted by his death. Among many others he was an ever welcome visitor in the family of Mr. James Ryan, whose two sons and five daughters were among the most edifying of his many penitents. He had applied to the Ursuline Convent at Cork to undertake the new foundation of their order in Boston, but they declined the offer. In Mr. Ryan's family all were edified by the accounts he gave of his former life, his conversion, his labors in America and of his intention to introduce the Ursulines into Boston. His words on this last subject deeply touched the pure hearts of two of his gentle hearers, daughters of Mr. Ryan, but neither of these communicated to the other her intention to offer herself to Father Thayer's holy purpose. The two sisters, Mary and Catharine Ryan, had been educated at the Ursuline Convent at Thurles, and both were fitted naturally by education and by grace for the task. Each sister, unknown to the other, offered to join Father Thayer's convent. But the good father moved slowly. He had found in all his projects the greatest efficacy in prayer. After long and earnest prayer and frequent offerings of the holy Mass, Father Thayer at last wrote to Bishop Cheverus, first Bishop of Boston, and sent him the letters of self-dedication of the two pious sisters. Rev. Richard Walsh, of Limerick, also wrote and assured the Bishop that they were chosen and providential instruments for beginning the projected monastery. Bishop Cheverus and Dr. Matignon, his friend and zealous and able assistant, joyously accepted the proposals, and immediately wrote for the good sisters, Mary and Catharine Ryan, to come to Boston, promising that every

preparation should be made for their reception, and that arrangements would be made for them to make their novitiate in the Ursuline Convent long located at the French settlement of Three Rivers, in Canada. Each of the sisters received the tidings with joy; but their rapture was unbounded when each sister discovered that she was to have the other for her sister and companion in religion. Father Thayer's joy was greater even than that of his daughters in religion. He busied himself in making every preparation for their voyage to America. But he was at this time made sensible of an insidious disease that was undermining his health, and his noble purpose was delayed, but not defeated, by his own death.

Another generous purpose of Father Thayer for the conversion of his own American countrymen was to introduce into Boston learned ecclesiastics of religious orders, whose houses were suppressed by the Reign of Terror and the revolution in France and by the disasters of the times throughout Europe. He thus addressed on this subject a letter to the Abbé Matignon at Boston, dated at London, June 3, 1805, from which we take the following passage:

> The funds of the Scotch Benedictines of St. James, Ratisbon, have been lately seized by the elector. In this house there are four monks, viz., F. M. Graham (aged 38), an universal genius; F. B. Sharp (30), F. B. Dessen (27) and F. McIver (26), all learned and pious. There are also three or four other Scotch monks at St. James, Wirceburg. All these, together with many other German religious suppressed, might by activity and exertion be obtained. You know that I am not easily discouraged, and that no efforts of mine will ever be wanting while life remains, and all without fee or reward. Exert yourself, my dear friend, and get the good Cheverus to do the same. There is a most glorious prospect before us; lands for establishment might surely be obtained cheap, or for nothing, from General Knox, from the holders of Waldo's and other patents in Maine, in New York from Cooper, etc., in Connecticut and Vermont from scattered Catholics. Mr. Salmon, Mr. Cheverus' friend, at Brompton, near Chatham, might be obtained for the mission by a line from him.

These latter plans of Father Thayer for the founding of a missionary establishment in America were never carried into effect; but his projected Ursuline Convent was founded even after his death. On May 4, 1817, Mary and Catharine Ryan, those good daughters and followers of his, sailed from Limerick in the ship Victory, and reached Boston in safety. Received with open arms and paternal benedictions by Bishop Cheverus and Dr. Matignon, the latter conducted the pious novices to the Ursuline Convent at Three Rivers. In 1818, when their novitiate had expired, he went to Three Rivers and brought the two Sisters, whose names in religion were Sisters Mary Joseph and Mary Magdalen, to an humble but comfortable convent, which Bishop Cheverus had prepared for them near his Cathedral in Boston.

It was this religious community of pious Ursulines which in its

propserous days was renewed and established by Bishop Fenwick at Mount Benedict (and here the name of St. Benedict Joseph Labre, being also the name of Bishop Fenwick, was again adopted), at Charleston, and here the convent was destroyed by fire by an infuriated and bigoted mob of Boston on the night of August 11, 1834, the sad accounts of which are given in our Catholic histories.

In 1815 Father Thayer's health began to fail under the dreadful disease of dropsy. He had by his wise and prudent management nearly doubled the funds he had collected for the long-desired foundation of an Ursuline Convent at Boston. He bequeathed these funds and his noble purposes to the faithful care of Doctors Cheverus and Matignon. His death was most saintly, and during his illness he was faithfully and gratefully nursed by his religious friends and future Ursulines, Mary and Catharine Ryan. Though suffering excruciating pains, he suffered with patient cheerfulness and joy. He continued to hear the confessions of his dear penitents while confined to his bed and suffering every pain, and this he continued to do even on the very day of his death. Father Thayer, venerated and beloved by the people of Limerick, expired in sanctity on February 17, 1815.

The following notice of his death is from a Protestant paper, the *Orthodox Journal*, London, February, 1815: "On Friday, the 17th February, the Rev. Mr. Thayer breathed his last at his lodgings at Limerick, in the 57th year of his age. This lamented and much esteemed individual was a native of Boston, in America, of respectable parents, gifted with great genius, a liberal mind and unbounded love of study. He lived and died in the communion and ministry of his adoption, in a manner worthy of his eminent virtues and pious simplicity—he decked religion in mildness, and he reclaimed the wanderer by captivating the heart. In the social circle he was completely the gentleman, the scholar and the wit—he had an even gaiety of temper, a clearness and aptness of expression and facility of anecdote, rarely equaled, certainly never exceeded. No wonder his death is lamented—but his is the death of the just."

Richard H. Clarke.

New York.

FACE TO FACE WITH CHRIST?

THE eighteenth century was largely occupied with the international struggle for the temperate zones, or the areas of the earth's surface best fitted for colonization by the white races of mankind. But towards the end of the same century a new political ambition began to develop. The struggle for the tropics and their trade has since then constituted a large part of international diplomacy. "The completion of this World Process," writes Mr. Bryce,[1] "is a specially great and fateful event, because it closes a page forever. The conditions that are now vanishing can never recur. The civilized and semi-civilized races cannot relapse into their former isolation. It is hardly too much to say that for economic purposes all mankind is fast becoming one people, in which the hitherto backward nations are taking a place analogous to that which the unskilled workers have held in each one of the civilized nations. Such an event opens a new stage in world-history, a stage whose significance has perhaps been as yet scarcely realized either by the thinker or by the man of action."

Now it is precisely at this critical period, when the civilized world is assuming, in a manner, the responsibility for the proper development of the lower races, that we are brought face to face with the person and the teaching of Christ more closely than ever before. No period of time has ever been subjected to such a minute scrutiny as that of Christ's earthly life. The textual critic and the higher critic, the historian and the antiquarian vie with each other in their search for light from every scrap of evidence that bears on the life of Christ. The publishing houses of Berlin and London, of Paris and New York are issuing whole libraries of literature concerning the same theme. Meanwhile, the theodolite and the surveyor's chain, the pickaxe and the shovel are in constant requisition to give us a fuller knowledge of the Holy Land, past and present, while the painter's brush and the tourist's kodak draw attention to the more minute features of place and scenery which otherwise would escape the student's eye. In consequence, the historic person and the human character of Christ have been set into such clear light that in hardly any century, excepting perhaps in that of our Lord Himself, have men been as well acquainted with Jesus of Nazareth as we are. Nor can it be said that this knowledge of Christ is confined to the learned and the few. Our sermons and our catechetical instructions, our popular lives of Christ and our

[1] Romanes Lecture, p. 8 f.

magazine articles with their excellent illustrations have contributed their full share to the spread of the knowledge of Christ. Not only our men of the learned professions, but our artisans and workmen too are more than ever face to face with Jesus the Christ.

And what can the knowledge of Christ contribute to the development of the lower races who have now become "the burden" of the white man? This question will be answered, at least in part, by the words of Keshub Chunder Sen: "If you wish to secure that attachment and allegiance of India, it must be through spiritual influence and moral suasion. And such indeed has been the case in India. You cannot deny that your hearts have been touched, conquered and subjugated by a superior power. That power, need I tell you, is Christ. It is Christ who rules British India, and not the British Government. England has sent out a tremendous moral force in the life and character of that mighty prophet, to conquer and hold this vast empire." The moral influence exerted by the knowledge of Christ over the great masses of mankind is described still more clearly in Max Göhre's recent volume entitled "Drei Monate Fabrik-Arbeiter." He first sets forth the inner life of that formidable democracy growing up in modern Germany, alienated from all social order and from all religious form. The picture of the workmen in the Chemnitz factory is especially dark, since it presents the lapse from all definite Christian belief. "One thing only has remained in all of them," the author adds, "esteem and reverence for Jesus Christ. Even the most outspoken Social Democrat and hater of faith has that; yes, assuredly, he has it in greater measure than many a man not devoted to the Social Democratic propaganda." After developing this statement at some length, the author concludes: "They all hold themselves in thoughtful silence before this great Personality."

In spite of the omnipotent moral influence attributed to a knowledge of Christ, it is not the whole Christ that has been brought face to face with either the castes of India or the Social Democrats of Germany. The apparition in which these men are interested is human, not divine. What wonder, then, if many regard this Christ as a dreamer, "a beautiful but ineffectual angel, beating in the void his luminous wings in vain." Their attitude to Christ is one of admiration, no doubt; perhaps of religious awe; but it is not the subjection of faith. And worse still, it is not only the pagans of India and the Social Democrats of Germany that are in our days brought face to face with a partial Christ. The whole Christian world seems to be exposed to the temptation to regard only the human side of Christ. All the labors and efforts of the last sixty years are calculated to emphasize more and more the person and

character of the Son of man; hardly any new light has been thrown on Jesus, the Son of God.

And the end is not yet. The divinity of our Lord has not only been neglected in the literature of recent time; in many cases it is either directly or indirectly denied. Modern science, comparative religion, and historical criticism have joined forces against a true life of Christ. In the elements that enter into the life of Christ we may distinguish three formalities: their supernaturality, their evidence, and their historicity. Modern science tends to imperil their supernaturality; comparative religion invalidates their evidence; historical criticism denies their historicity. We do not say that these branches of learning necessarily produce these effects. On the contrary, if their true principles be adhered to, they will rather aid than impede the student of the life of Christ. We merely maintain that, in point of fact, our present-day science tends to make of Christ a perfect man; comparative religion leads toward Christian agnosticism; historical criticism inclines towards making of Christ a legendary hero.

1. We said that modern science tends to lead us away from faith in Christ's divinity, because it tends to destroy the supernatural element in the life of the Master. Not as if the best scientists denied the possibility of miracles. Such a position would be too hard to defend. But our scientific bent leads us to seek for a natural explanation of even the most extraordinary phenomena. A recent writer who professes to be a believing Christian describes the situation in these words: "The miraculous element in the Gospels is a very serious crux. This is a burning question, on which both caution and candor are necessary. Primitive man lives among miracles; he expects them, and he finds them. . . . In unscientific ages belief in miracles is not a sign of piety. Everybody shares it; it puts no strain on the conscience of men; it is simply the most obvious and natural way to account for anything unusual. . . . These are indications of a state of things so different from our own that we cannot be surprised if the religious symbols of that age do not appeal to us quite as they did to the first Christians."[2]

The Bishop of Ripon endeavors to show his readers how they may believe in the veracity of the inspired writers, and still disbelieve their reports of miraculous occurrences: "In the course of our Bible study we meet not only narratives of certain events which took place, and certain phenomena which were observed, but also with the contemporary interpretation of the event or of the phenomenon. The judicious student will not feel bound to accept the writer's interpretation of everything which he narrates. In

2 "Contentio Veritatis," p. 87.

fact, phenomenon or event is one thing; the interpretation which the narrator puts upon these is quite another. In his interpretation he is limited by the knowledge current in his age. We may put the matter this way. We moderns, seeing such phenomena, would not describe them as the ancients did. This would not mean that we discredited the fact or existence of the phenomena, but that being what we are, and knowing what we know, we must describe them in one way, whereas the earlier writers, no less honest than ourselves, being what they were, and knowing what they knew, were constrained to describe them as they did."[3] After this the Bishop illustrates his meaning by an appeal to John v. The evangelist ascribes the stirring of the water and the consequent healing power to the presence of an angel, while a modern writer would speak of the pool as a medicinal spring. The fact remains the same, at least it does so according to the view of His Lordship, only its description differs.

According to these principles the only true miracles of healing worked by Jesus must be reduced to those cures "which even at the present day physicians are able to effect by physical methods as, more especially, cures of mental maladies." Others seemingly miraculous narratives are in reality only figurative expressions. Thus at the death of Jesus darkness, *i. e.*, sorrow, spreads over all the earth;[4] graves, *i. e.*, the bonds of human misery, open;[5] the veil in the temple, *i. e.*, the separation between God and his people, is rent in two.[6] Similarly, the withering fig-tree is a figure of the decaying Jewish people; the feeding of the multitude represents the teaching of Christ; the walking on the water and the stilling of the tempest are concrete representations of Christ's words: "If you have faith as a grain of mustard seed, etc." In a word, to-day's scientific bent of mind inclines the student of the life of Christ to seek for a natural explanation of those phenomena that are represented as miracles by the inspired writers of the New Testament.

Even the greatest miracles, Christ's virgin birth and resurrection, are not exempt from this general leveling tendency. Of the former a natural explanation is suggested by the Dean of Ripon, and published in the *Contemporary Review:* "In Darwin's book on 'The Changes of Plants and Animals Under Domestication' he points out that parthenogenesis is found much higher than is generally known in the organized creation, and he asks why the operation of the male is required, the germ or ovum of the female being com-

[3] The Temple Bible, p. 50 f.
[4] Mk. xv., 33; Mt. xxvii., 45; Lk. xxiii., 44.
[5] Mt. xxvii., 52.
[6] Mk. xv., 38; Mt. xxvii., 51; Lk. xxiii., 45.

plete in itself. He answers that he can give no reason except, probably, that force and energy is thus added. If, then, the accounts in the Gospels—that is, Matthew i. and Luke i.—are true literally, the meaning of my suggestion would be that the yearnings of a young Hebrew woman, longing with intense and holy desire to be the mother of the Messiah (which longings were the direct action of the Holy Spirit), excited and quickened the germ within her, and produced in this case what is usually produced by the action of the male."[7] The writer then goes on to say that unless this explanation be adopted, the word "miracle" must be invoked. Now, this must not be permitted. For, on the one hand, it is nothing but a confession of our ignorance; on the other, "miracle" in this sense is neither a Scriptural word nor a Scriptural idea.

Archbishop Temple writes in the same strain concerning our Lord's resurrection: "It is quite possible that our Lord's resurrection may be found hereafter to be no miracle at all in the scientific sense. It foreshadows and begins the general resurrection; when that general resurrection comes we may find that it is, after all, the natural issue of physical laws always at work. There is nothing at present to indicate anything of the sort; but a general resurrection in itself implies not a special interference, but a general rule."[8] In what follows, His Grace reasons that if the machinery which brings about our resurrection implies nothing miraculous, there ought to be no miracle in the fact that the same machinery effects the resurrection of our Lord.

We quote these attempts to naturalize the virgin birth and the resurrection of Jesus Christ as instances showing the general tendency of non-Catholic writers to drift away from the miraculous. If then every supernatural event be reduced to the order of nature, is it probable that the incarnation alone will escape? True, attempts have been made to base the incarnation on a moral miracle instead of proving it from a physical wonder. Dr. Bruce, *e. g.*, writes in his interesting book entitled "The Miraculous in the Gospels:"[9] "To the faith of the Church Jesus Christ is sinless in spirit and conduct, unerring in spiritual insight, original as a religious teacher; in the strictest sense a moral miracle. His character is the one miracle vitally important to faith. Believers could part with the physical miracles of the Gospels if science or exegesis demanded the sacrifice; but if a sinless Christ were taken from us on the plea that the moral order of the world knows only of imperfect men, all would be lost. Nothing less than a sinless, infallible, incomparably original man is demanded by the titles and func-

[7] August, p. 236.
[8] Bampton Lectures for 1884, ed. 1903, p. 196 f.
[9] Fourth ed., 1894, p. 320.

tions ascribed to Christ. The Son of God must be holy, as God is holy." Mr. Inge's view of the case does not differ materially from that of Dr. Bruce. "The sinlessness of Christ," he writes, "is the one of His divine attributes which we cannot afford to part with. We might dispense with the belief in His power over nature whilst He lived as man amongst men, but to give up His divine character is to sever the most precious link in the chain which binds heaven and earth together."[10]

But Dr. Bruce has been the first to see the inconsistency of such a view. "All the miraculous must go," he says, "if any goes on speculative grounds. The moral miracles must be sacrificed to the Moloch of naturalism not less than the physical."[11] Besides, the sinlessness of Christ, in a manner, presupposes His divinity. If Christ be not acknowledged as God, such wonders as the Gadarene miracle and the withering of the fig-tree are hardly consistent with perfect human sinlessness. Again, the perfect human character of Christ presupposes His divinity. "In His case," writes the Bishop of Ripon, "the dilemma is put forward somewhat in this fashion. Either Jesus Christ knew or He did not know the great laws of the universe. If He did know, He is open to the charge of allowing people to continue in great and harmful errors; if He did not know, what becomes of the claim that He is one with God?"[12] The horns of this dilemma are quite innocuous to him who supposes that Jesus is one with God, who supposes that Jesus has the same wise grounds for withholding the erudition in question from men which God Himself had for concealing it from His reasonable creatures. But what will he answer who reverences in Christ only the Son of man?

The tendency of minimizing the supernatural element in the life of Christ has made itself felt even in the works of some Catholic writers. Not to mention other instances, Professor Schell has contributed to the historical series "Weltgeschichte in Charakterbildern" the volume entitled "Christus, Das Evangelium und seine weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung."[13] The very fact that a monograph on Christ is published among purely profane character sketches seems to imply a certain amount of a naturalizing process of the supernatural element in the life of Christ. It is in keeping with this antecedent suspicion of ours that Jesus finds but scant recognition in Professor Schell's work in as far as He is our Redeemer and our God. It is only accidentally, as it were, and in passing that these chief characteristics of Christ are brought before the

10 "Contentio Veritatis," p. 97.

11 "The Miraculous Elements in the Gospels," p. 12.

12 The Temple Bible, p. 52 f.

13 Mainz, 1903, Kirchheim.

reader. Schell defends the supernatural character of the exorcisms attributed to Christ, and in this point he contrasts most favorably with several other modern writers. At the same time he believes that St. Mark personifies the interior affections and passions in their strife against the dictates of reason and the promptings of grace. Here he appears to yield a point to modern naturalists; or does not the alleged personification imply a denial of the reality of immediate possession? Our exceptions to the features of Christ as drawn by Professor Schell may appear trifling. But they are of prime importance in so far as they show that the author fails to bring us face to face with the whole Christ.

2. While the scientific tendency of our age tends to naturalize the supernatural elements in the life of our Lord, and thus to imperil the faith in His divinity, comparative religion denies the evidence of all supernatural facts, and thus undermines the very foundation of Christian apologetics. We will not here insist on the vagaries of those writers who draw the life of Christ within the range of comparative mythology. They find in pagan myths and legends parallels to the preëxistence of the person of Jesus Christ, to His miraculous conception and birth, to His offices of Redeemer and divine Legate, to His passion and death, to His descent into hell and His resurrection, to His ascension into heaven and his sitting at the right hand of the Father, finally to His second coming and His apocalyptic nuptials.[14] These extreme views are still repudiated by the greater part of rationalists. In fact, men like Zimmern and Gunkel are the worst foes of rationalism. For, on the one hand, their theories are dreams rather than scientific hypotheses; on the other, they are the legitimate outcome of rationalistic principles.

M. A. Canney states the views of comparative religion concerning Jesus Christ and His teaching in a more sober way.[15] "Comparative *mythology* shows that man has given explanations of the universe which indicate that the mind moves everywhere along very similar lines. Comparative *religion* teaches that even when men had attained to no small degree of general culture they still demanded outward and visible signs of the efficacy of their faith. The sage, or the founder of a religion, who claimed to enlighten his fellows, was expected to produce evidence, apart from his teaching, that he was endowed in a peculiar and extraordinary

[14] Zimmern, "Keilinschriften und Bibel," Berlin, 1903, p. 39 ff.; Zimmern in Schrader's "Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament," 3te Aufl., Berlin, 1903, pp. 377-394; Gunkel, "Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständniss des Neuen Testaments," Göttingen, 1903; Wille, "Die Christus-Mythe als monistiche Weltanschauung, Berlin, 1903.

[15] Encyclopædia Biblica, vol. iv., col. 5352.

way. As a witness to his superiority, he was expected to perform wonders. And as such a one was in most cases, owing to his superior knowledge, on a higher level than his contemporaries, he was, no doubt, often as a matter of fact able to do things which to them appeared wonderful; he may often have been able to cure diseases, perhaps even to restore to life a body that was to all appearance lifeless; he was, no doubt, often able to exercise a remarkable influence over men's minds, and perhaps to cure certain mental diseases. It is difficult to calculate the effect that such a display of power would have on those who did not understand its nature. It is easy, on the other hand, to understand that such evidence of a power out of the common having been furnished, wonders of a different nature would also be ascribed to the Master by His disciples, especially after His decease. His works and His teaching would seem to combine to suggest that He did not belong to the life of the earth; He must be a favorite of one of the deities, or of the Deity, or a son of one of the deities, or of the Deity, or even an actual deity come in the flesh."

The reader has noticed throughout that Mr. Canney develops his system in such a way as to make it applicable to our Lord. And as if the writer were afraid that Christ might not be lowered to the level of the other religious founders, he adds such characteristics that are applied to Jesus exclusively: "The wonders with which He would now be accredited would no longer be relative and natural, but absolute and supernatural. It would be represented, especially after his decease, that the manner of His appearance in the world and of His disappearance from it when His mission had been accomplished, were alike remarkable; that if His mother was human, His Father was Divine; that if He seemed to die like other men, it was not so in reality. He would no longer be described as merely healing diseases, physical and psychical, by natural, but little understood, means. He has become superior to the laws of nature. He walks upon the sea and stills its waves, commands the wind and the storm, cures instantaneously the deaf, the dumb, the blind, brings to life those who have actually died."

The tenets of comparative religion have thus far found little favor among believing Christians. Still, they are spreading, and they find their way into the works even of Catholic writers. In fact, men like the Abbé Loisy present the views of comparative religion so systematically and clearly that they make more converts than the prime originators of the theory could hope to make. We must not be misunderstood. When we speak of system and clearness in Loisy's book, we use the terms in a relative sense, not in their absolute meaning. Loisy is much clearer in his use of the

expressions "Christian conscience" and "experience of faith," *e. g.*, than the Protestant writers among whom these phrases are household words. At the same time, there is nothing more difficult to grasp than the sense in which Loisy endeavors to "catholicize" these expressions. Among Protestants they denote the internal principle of immediate inspiration as distinct from and opposed to the external authority of the Church; but what can be their Catholic meaning? And let not our reader grow impatient at our criticism of a laborious priest censured by his ecclesiastical superiors and humbly submissive to this censure. From the first, Loisy's letter to Cardinal Richard contained no disavowal of his opinions as an historian; it was an act of respectful deference in conformity with ecclesiastical discipline. And now the writer's respectful silence has lasted long enough. He has published his ultimatum, as it were, in the form of a collection of letters entitled "Autour d'un petit livre." It is to the pages of this publication that we shall refer in the following paragraphs.[16]

Loisy leads us back to the fundamental ideas of "revelation," "revealed religion," and "Christian revelation." The beginning of revelation, we are told, consists in the perception of one's relation to God, *i. e.*, of the relation between the self-conscious subject and the God present under the world of phenomena. The progress of revealed religion consists in the deepening and broadening of this same perception. In other words, revealed religion develops in proportion with the number of relations man perceives to exist between himself and God, and in proportion with the clearness and perfection of the same perception.[17] Now, God reveals Himself to man according to the capacity of man. Hence the development of faith keeps pace with man's intellectual and moral development. And this for the simple reason that revelation can be nothing else than man's consciousness of his relations to God. Even Christian revelation, in its beginning, is nothing else than Christ's perception of His relation to God, and of men's relations to the heavenly Father.[18] This is somewhat clearer, indeed, than the language of the comparative religionists. Their revelation is said to be the awakening self-consciousness of our religious instinct; the perception of the divine inside and outside of ourselves; the spontaneous ebullition of our feelings in the presence of physical or moral beauty and the instinctive outcry, "God, oh God."

There is a serious difficulty in this simple explanation of revelation, and religion, and faith. How can their supernaturality be

[16] Cf. Études, Nov. 5, 1903, pp. 305-325.
[17] P. 196 f.
[18] P. 195 f.

accounted for? Man's perception of his relation to God does not imply anything supernatural. Between Christian revelation and Mosaic revelation, on the one hand, and the revelation of Manu, and Buddha, and Confucius, and Mahomet, on the other, there is a difference of degree only, not of kind. In other words, Jesus Christ perceived His relations to God more completely and more thoroughly than any of the other religious founders; but there was no difference of kind between His insight and that of His predecessors or followers. The Abbé Loisy has felt this difficulty; hence, he endeavors to explain the supernatural element in revelation. The perception of religious truths, he tells us, is not the work of reason alone. It is an intellectual activity performed under the impulse of the heart, of our religious and moral feeling and of a sincere will for the good. Such a continuous activity becomes unintelligible unless one sees in it the work of God Himself. Man seeks, but God incites him to do so; man sees, but God enlightens him. It is for this reason that both object and efficient cause of revelation are supernatural, seeing that they are one with God.[19] But this explanation is not sufficient to account for a difference of kind between supernatural and natural revelation; in both God is object and first efficient cause.

Totally unconscious of the inadequacy of the explanation he gives of revelation, and religion, and faith, Loisy goes on to square his system with Christian dogma. He freely acknowledges that the term "dogma" conveys to the heart of the Catholic a truth as unchangeable as God Himself.[20] Now, he says, this may be true in the light of faith, but it is radically false in the light of reason. The truth within us is something necessarily conditional, necessarily relative, always open to increase or diminution.[21] Nor is the Abbé at a loss how to reconcile his relativity of dogma with our Christian faith. The ecclesiastical formulas are not absolutely true, since they do not define the full reality of the truth they represent. They are, nevertheless, the symbols of absolute truth; they are its best and safest expressions until the Church shall think it well to modify them by explaining them. And what do the faithful believe, in the meantime? They believe, we are told, intentionally at least, the full and absolute truth symbolized by the imperfect and relative dogmatic formulas.[22] In other words, the faithful believe to-day what the Church does not yet believe, but what she will believe perhaps to-morrow if she happens to drift that far in the fluctuations of human knowledge. Perhaps the expressions of

[19] P. 197 f.
[20] P. 188.
[21] P. 191.
[22] P. 206.

Loisy are susceptible of a more favorable explanation; but those who appeal from the present Church to the Church of the future are usually defenders of the theory of absolute truth symbolized by relative formulas.

It seems then that we must admit a two-fold order of truths, those of reason and those of faith. The former are knowable and known; the latter are unknowable and believed. Whatever satisfies our religious instinct, whatever is suggested by our religious conscience and experience, is true in the light of faith. But may not this truth be false in the light of reason? May not faith say yes, where science says no? In point of fact, Loisy's theory seems to introduce into the sphere of Catholic theology Ritschl's so-called value-judgments with their total opposition to the existence-judgments of science. These latter deal with facts, with things as they are; they belong to the domain of science. The value-judgments view things as they are related to personal emotions and volitions, they deal with values; they belong to the domain of religion.

For our present purpose, it is of little importance whether Loisy strictly adheres to the theory of the older Ritschl, or prefers the modifications introduced by Ritschl's most eminent pupils, Herrmann and Kaftan; again, whether he follows Otto Ritschl's explanation of his father's system, or prefers the expositions of the theory given by Max Reischle and Max Scheibe. In any case, the law of scientific exegesis differs from the law of ecclesiastical interpretation. What is more, scientific exegesis is pronounced wholly independent of the Church, of the Pope and of the Councils.[23] Loisy's historian regards *faith* in Christ as the founder of the Church; his theologian believes that *Christ* Himself has founded the Church.[24] The historian sees in the primacy of the Roman Pontiff a *development* coördinate with that of the Church; the theologian, again, believes that *Christ* intended the primacy from the first.[25] For the historian, Papal infallibility is the outcome of ecclesiastical centralization; for the theologian, the same prerogative was designed by God Himself, and conferred by Jesus Christ.[26]

In the light of these statements one has reason to feel disturbed at Loisy's contention that neither Christ's resurrection nor His Divinity are truths belonging to the historical order.[27] Of course, we have the writer's explicit profession of faith in Christ divinity.[28] At the same time, the writer believes that as soon as a truth is an

[23] P. 52.
[24] P. 172.
[25] P. 176.
[26] P. 182.
[27] Pp. 162, 169.
[28] P. 13.

article of faith, it is no longer a matter of demonstration. The passion and death of Christ, His resurrection from the dead, the divine institution of the Church, are articles of faith; hence they cannot be proved.[29] History therefore pronounces the verdict "not proven" concerning one and all of these facts.[30] Scientifically speaking, all of them are doubtful. And what would be the condition of our faith if a more profound scientific study should result in the verdict "fiction?" The Abbé seems to have foreseen this difficulty. The wonderful power of the idea of the kingdom of God and the actual personal experience of the same are, he assures us, a sufficient groundwork and stay of our faith.[31] The decrees of the Vatican Council may differ from Loisy's views and theories; but the dogmatic formulas drawn up by the Council may be changed when the faith of the Church shall catch up to the rapid pace of her devout child. Who knows?

3. The scientific trend of mind is inclined to minimize the supernatural element in the life of Christ; the comparative religionists of the present day introduce a state of agnosticism into the region of Christian faith; but both are outdone by the modern historical critic. The first foe touches, after all, only the supernaturality of the facts in question; the second denies only their evidence; but the third simply brushes them out of the realm of realities. Professor Paul W. Schmiedel, who has contributed the article entitled "Gospels" to the "Encyclopædia Biblica,"[32] divides the contents of the Gospels into two classes: absolutely credible passages, and doubtful matter. The absolutely credible passages are reduced to nine, five of which refer to Jesus Himself, and four to His miracles. These, we are told, are the historical foundation-pillars for a scientific life of Jesus. And what a life they would furnish. The question "why callest thou Me good?"[33] the three statements that blasphemy against the Son can be forgiven;[34] that Christ's relations held Him to be beside Himself,[35] and that the Son of Man does not know "of that day and of that hour,"[36] to gether with the invocation "my God, my God; why hast thou forsaken me?"[37] are to be the only certain elements in the life of our Lord. Perhaps the four absolutely credible passages concerning miracles will add more consistency to this vague picture of Christ; in reality they add

29 Pp. 161, 162, 169.
30 P. 8.
31 P. 116.
32 Vol. II., col. 1761 ff.
33 Mark x., 17.
34 Matt. xii., 31.
35 Mk. iii., 21.
36 Mk. xiii., 32.
37 Mk. xv., 34; Mt. xxvii., 46.

darkness rather than light. Jesus declines to work a sign;[38] He is not able to do mighty works in Nazareth;[39] He identifies the feeding of the multitudes with His teaching them,[40] and finally He sends an answer to John the Baptist, again identifying His miraculous works with the internal effects of His teaching;[41] such are according to the interpretation of Professor Schmiedel the only reliable passages of the Gospels concerning the miracles of our Lord. And what becomes of the rest? It must be confessed that the professor is too generous to relegate everything else to the region of fiction. Much is assigned to the range of the doubtful. This generosity is amply rewarded; for even what is historically doubtful is perfectly innocuous from an apologetic point of view.

We do not say that all critical historians go the full length of Schmiedel's position; nor do we maintain that all attain only negative results. The reader is, no doubt, acquainted with works of this class that truly deserve our praise in many respects. Some of them have elicited during the last few years almost a specific literature of their own. We need mention only Harnack's "Wesen des Christentum's" to conjure up in our minds a picture of successive editions each consisting of thousands of copies, of pamphlets and books, and magazine articles, and lectures, and sermons even, all advocating or attacking or expounding the Berlin professor's theory of Christianity. Whatever Harnack may have taken away from Christ, he has vindicated His originality and His claim to be the Son of God in a special manner. He thus insists that the Gospel is more than a merely social programme of the Jewish nation, or a political code; Jesus is more than the mere Messias of the Jews. Moreover, according to Harnack, the death of Christ was looked upon even by the first Christian community as a sacrifice for the remission of sin; it was not St. Paul who first introduced this belief in the sacrifice of atonement.

We have drawn attention to the foregoing points in Harnack's theory in order to emphasize the contrast between the Protestant critic and the Abbé Loisy. The latter distinguishes three strata, as it were, of ideas concerning the person and the work of Jesus Christ. First, we have the views of Jesus concerning Himself; secondly, we have the faith of the earliest Christian community; thirdly, we have the Christology of the New Testament. In illustrating and explaining these three strata we shall have occasion to refer to Loisy's former work entitled "L'Evangile et l'Eglise." This cannot be considered unfair after the author's so-called subjection

[38] Mark viii., 12.
[39] Mk. vi., 5 f.
[40] Mk. viii., 14-21.
[41] Mt. xi., 5; Lk. vii., 22.

to the verdict of his ecclesiastical superiors, since he does not retract anything contained in the book itself.[42]

Jesus suspected in Himself nothing supernatural except that He was destined to become the Messias, or God's principal agent and vicar in the kingdom of heaven. He identified the title "Son of God" with that of "Messias;" in this sense He suspected or knew that He was destined to become the Son of God.[43] The kingdom of God He identified with the Messianic kingdom expected by the Jewish nation. The coming of this kingdom He placed in the immediate future, so that He had no idea of His own death, no thought of a church, much less of a ceremonial. It was only at the last moment, when the immediate coming of the kingdom became evidently impossible in the Jewish world, that Jesus began to conceive another coming of the kingdom by means of the death of the Messias.[44] Similarly the Abbé reasons in his recent publication:[45] "Jesus did not reveal His divinity; He was not really conscious of it. He shared the prejudices, the illusions and even the errors of His contemporaries. Only the consciousness of His intimate relation to God and of His future Messiasship distinguished Him from the rest of men. We do not now say that the hypostatic union implies Christ's inerrancy as essentially as it involves His substantial sanctity. Nor do we maintain that a denial of His inerrancy implies a denial of His divinity as necessarily as the latter would be implied in a denial of His sinlessness. Still, a Christ without the prerogative of a supereminent knowledge is not the whole Christ either for the Catholic theologian or for the devout layman.

The second stratum of ideas concerning Christ and His teaching is that found in the earliest Christian community. In Loisy's theory of development of Christian doctrine this stratum is a necessary step between Christ's own view of Himself and the character given to Him in the writings of the New Testament. To begin, then, it is plain that the first Christian community believed that Jesus had become the Christ or the Messias by virtue of His resurrection; similarly, He had become the Son of God in the sense that He had become the Messias. Again, His Messianic coming was expected to be imminent, since His first appearance in the flesh could not be regarded as a Messianic advent.[46] Thus far we have not even an implicit faith in the divinity of Jesus Christ; how can we account

[42] Cf. Revue biblique, Avril, 1903, pp. 292-313; Zeitschr. f. Katholische Theologie, IV., 1903, pp. 684-701.

[43] Pp. 53, 54, 57.

[44] Pp. 26, 31, 51, 181.

[45] "Autour d'un petit livre," p. 130, 139.

[46] "L'Évangile et l'Église," pp. 55 ff.

for its development? Christian piety, Loisy tells us, kept on elevating Christ higher and higher, seeking God in Him and finding God.[47] Its starting point was Jesus invested with the Messianic dignity by virtue of His resurrection. Through Him, and in Him, and with Him, the earliest Christians prayed to the heavenly Father, and insensibly they commenced to pray to Christ Himself. It is quite inconceivable to the Abbé Loisy that Christianity should not have implied the worship of Christ, and it does not appear rash to him to say that this worship of Christ preceded, and sustained, and inspired the line of Christian thought concerning the person of the Redeemer.[48]

The third stratum of Christological ideas we find in the writings of the New Testament. Thus far it is Christ's resurrection that is regarded as the starting point of Jesus' Messiasship and divine Sonship. According to Loisy, the more thoughtful Christians must have asked themselves whether Jesus had been anything more than other men before His resurrection. In other words, what was Jesus independently of His Messiasship acquired by virtue of His resurrection? This question began to be answered by St. Paul, and kept on being more fully treated till it found its final settlement in the writings of St. John. First, St. Paul looked at the off side of the resurrection, and discovered in the death of Christ a meaning and an efficacity quite independent of His rising from the dead.[49] And still, thus far, only Christ's resurrection had counted for anything in the faith of Christians.[50] Hence, St. Paul argued, there must have been in Christ living on earth something more than human. Loisy is of opinion that the Paulinian theory of salvation was necessary in its time in order that Christianity might not remain a mere Jewish sect without any future.[51] St. Mark, indeed, speaks of man's redemption by the death of Christ; but the Abbé sees in this passage a mere trace of Paulinian influence on the second evangelist. The next great step in the development of Christian doctrine is due to St. John. The fourth evangelist took up Jesus constituted Christ by virtue of His resurrection, called Son of man or Son of God by reason of His Messiasship, elevated to the dignity of Redeemer of mankind by the apostle St. Paul, and pronounced Him the Word made flesh.[52] If the divinity of Christ had been believed in before St. John, St. John's expression would be nothing but a new way of saying an old thing. But, according

[47] Ibid, 207.
[48] Ibid, p. 206 ff.
[49] Ibid, p. 73.
[50] Ibid, pp. 69, 73.
[51] Ibid, p. 136.
[52] Ibid, p. 189.

to Loisy, the Christian community had not as yet begun to believe in the divinity of our Lord. What then can have been the motive of conferring on Jesus this new dignity? However great a step in Christian thought may be implied in St. John's language,[53] it was the only suitable way of translating the Hebrew Messianic idea into Greek thought.[54] Here then you have St. John's motive for calling Jesus "the Word made flesh;" he wished to make Christianity, which up to His time had been only a Jewish movement, based on the idea of the Messianic kingdom, acceptable to the Græco-Roman world and to humanity in general.[55] We may note in passing, that Loisy religiously derives the whole of Christian dogma from the writings of the New Testament, after he has said enough to shake the faith of his readers in all the contents of the New Testament.

Abstracting now for a moment from all the sins against faith and reason committed by our Christian naturalists, and agnostics, and historical critics, what after all does the image of Christ amount to which they paint for us? We may describe it in the words in which one of our most eminent foes describes Christ's image represented in the Gospels: "One may perhaps venture to compare the process with that of a photographer who prints from many negatives of the same individual on the same paper. There is produced in this way an 'average' likeness which when viewed from some distance seems satisfactory enough, but when it is more closely viewed the vagueness of its contours is at once discovered." What shall we say in answer to all that is advanced by this "spirit that dissolveth Jesus?" They prove no more than the false witnesses did in our Lord's trial before the ecclesiastical authorities of the Jews. Our Lord taught us that silence was the most effective answer in His case. In fact, argument against the theories we have described would resemble Don Quixote's fighting the windmills. It is quite plain, too, that our modern theorists do not bring us face to face with Christ. Only the Catholic Church says now what St. Paul wrote to the Philippians[56] at the very dawn of Christianity: "I esteem all things to be but loss, for the excellent knowledge of Jesus Christ my Lord."

A. J. Maas, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

---

53 Ibid, cf. p. 137.
54 P. 140.
55 Ibid, p. 134.
56 III., 8.

Scientific Chronicle.

BACTERIA AS SOIL FERTILIZERS.

Quite commonly bacteria are looked upon with suspicion, if not directly condemned as positively injurious to man. Science, however, is vindicating the claim of many of these little animalculæ to our respect and gratitude. Among these the Radiocola or "nitrifying" bacteria which enable plants to secure the necessary supply of nitrogen, even when the soil is poor, must be classed.

In *Harper's Magazine* for November last Mr. Ray Stannard Baker gives an interesting account of the work of Professor Nobbe, of Tharandt, in Saxony, in this direction.

The chief constituents of all vegetable substances are oxygen, carbon, hydrogen and nitrogen. Nitrogen is the all-important element in the growth of the plant. Other elements required, like potassium and phosphorus, are usually present in abundance in the soil or can be supplied by many well-known fertilizers. If there is a deficit of nitrogen, it is much more difficult and expensive to supply it.

When land is said to be worn out, it is because the amount of these three elements necessary is not present in the soil. To supply the nitrogen then is the important point. The first step in the solution of this problem was made when it was proved that plants drew much of their nourishment from the air as well as from the earth.

This conclusion was reached by a series of experiments that proved that in a soil very poor in nitrogen certain plants that contain in their composition a large percentage of nitrogen grew to full maturity, taking the necessary nitrogen from the atmosphere. The familiar experience of the farmer who, when he finds that his land is run down by the overcropping with wheat or oats, for instance, which draw heavily on the earth's nitrogen, sows in other crops that grow luxuriantly and then ploughs them in and so restores the fertility of the land so that it will bear again crops of wheat and oats and other nitrogen-demanding plants, confirms this point. The crops that restore the soil are clover, lupin and other leguminous plants, including beans and peas. The growing and seeding down of a field of clover is familiar to all those who know anything about farming.

The next step in the investigation was the inquiry why do clover and lupin and beans flourish on worn-out land when other crops

will not? The first faint response to this question came in the discovery of the fact that these plants that flourish in this worn-out soil had their roots covered with small round swellings or tumors, to which the name nodules had been given. At first these nodules were put down as a disease of the plant, and no further attention was given to them until Professor Hellriegel, of Burnburg, took up the work. From his investigations he found that lupins that had nodules would grow in soil that had no nitrogen, while those that had no nodules would not grow. The conclusion drawn from this discovery was that these nodules in some unknown way enabled the plant to utilize the nitrogen of the air.

The next announcement was that these nodules were the result of minute bacteria found in the soil. Professor Beyerinck, of Munster, gave these bacteria the name of Radiocola. It was just at this time that Nobbe took up the work. He argued that since these bacteria were in the soil when the crops grew well, it might be possible to introduce them artificially in worn-out soil and thus make it productive. He went so far as to claim that even pure sand, such as that of the seashore, could be thus inoculated so that beans and peas planted there would form nodules and draw their nitrogen from the atmosphere.

In 1888 Professor Nobbe began a series of experiments in order to discover a practical method of soil inoculation. He gathered the nodule-covered roots of beans and peas, crushed them and made an extract of them in water. He then made a gelatine solution, to which he added some of this extract. Immediately millions of bacteria of many kinds began to grow. He separated the Radiocola from the other bacteria and made a clean culture of these in gelatine. This is why he wanted to inoculate the soil, and now began the test as to whether this could be done or not. The test was a severe one. A quantity of pure sand was selected, and to make sure that it contained no nitrogen or bacteria of any kind, it was perfectly sterilized by heating to very high temperatures three different times for the space of six hours each time. The sand was then placed in three jars and to the sand in each jar was added a small quantity of mineral food. To the first jar no nitrogen of any kind was supplied; the second received nitrogen by fertilizing it with saltpeter; the third was inoculated with some of his bacteria culture. He then planted beans in each jar. Small quantities of pure sterilized water were added to each jar in equal amounts.

The seeds sprouted in all three jars and for one week they were the same in appearance. Soon after that, however, they changed. The young shoots in the first jar, having no nitrogen and no inoculation, turned pale and finally died. The beans in the second jar

grew about as they would in a garden supplied with artificial fertilizer. In the third jar the plants showed a marvelous growth. Although the sand in this jar was just as free as that in the first from nitrogen, still the plants attained a vigorous and healthy growth, and when analyzed showed a high percentage of nitrogen. It was in this jar only that the nodules formed on the roots of the plants, thus showing beyond a doubt the possibility of soil inoculation, at least in the laboratory. Other plants were tried with suitable soil inoculation and with the same successful results.

Professor Nobbe called his bacteria culture "Nitragen" and he prepared separate cultures for each of the principal crops. They were put upon the market in 1894 and had a considerable sale. They are now manufactured in one of the great commercial laboratories on the Main. The cultures are put up in small glass bottles marked with the name of the crop from which it is especially adapted. In each bottle the yellow gelatinous mass in which the bacteria grow is covered with a moss-like scum resembling gray mould. This is nothing else than an accumulation of innumerable millions of these little oblong bacteria. A bottle of this culture costs about fifty cents and contains sufficient to fertilize about one-half an acre.

The method of applying the culture is very simple. The contents of the bottle are first diluted with warm water and then the seeds which have first been mixed with some earth are treated with this solution and thoroughly mixed with the soil. Then the mixture is partially dried so that the seeds may be readily sown. When sown the bacteria begin to propagate in the soil, their natural home, and by the time the seed sprouts and puts forth roots they are ready to form the nodules and extract, in some as yet unknown way, the necessary nitrogen from the air.

The United States Department of Agriculture has lately conducted a valuable set of experiments on an improved method of distributing the bacteria. Instead of a moist culture the bacteria are put up in a small dry mass that resembles an yeast cake. All that is required is a little soaking to prepare it for use, and in this form it may be shipped to greater distances without fear of deterioration. Plans are now under consideration by this department for the introduction of these cultures in localities in which the nodule-forming germ is deficient.

Another interesting point in connection with plant growth is the claim of Professor Nobbe that contact with the soil is not necessary for the growth of a plant. This he has proved experimentally. Just outside his greenhouse the professor has a row of trees, some of them from eight to ten inches in circumference at the base of the

trunk. These trees are growing in clean water without a sign of any kind of soil. They are suspended in glass jars surrounded by wooden cases, and when these cases are opened the roots may be seen hanging in the clear water. The oldest of these trees is from a seed that was immersed in water in 1878. Leaves and blossoms have come regularly each spring and in the winter the water and the roots froze hard all these years, and yet the second and the third generation has been grown from these trees under precisely the same conditions. To reach this result it was necessary to keep the trees supplied with food. This food was prepared in the laboratory, and every four weeks a small quantity of a solution of chlorate of potash, sulphate of magnesium, phosphate of potassium and a nitrate was added to the water of the jars. This result seems to indicate that there is in the soil no element necessary for plant life that man cannot manufacture and apply artificially.

These results seem to answer the rather gloomy views of Sir William Crookes and others, who lately wrote in a rather pessimistic strain about the world reaching the limits of its capacity for food production, while the population continued to increase enormously. The ultimate result of these inverse ratios was general starvation. Science steps in to dispell the gloom of these dire forebodings, and with the means of utilizing the vast store of nitrogen in the air, four-fifths of which consists of this element, there is no need of alarm about the food production of the earth keeping pace with the growth of the population.

WATER GAS.

Every student of chemistry knows that when steam is passed over incandescent carbon, it is dissociated, the reaction being represented, according to circumstances, by one or the other of these equations:

$$C+H_2O=CO+2H$$
$$C+2H_2O=2H_2+CO_2$$

In the first case carbon monoxide and hydrogen are formed; in the second case hydrogen and carbon dioxide, or carbonic acid gas, as it is sometimes called. The hydrogen and the carbon monoxide are combustible, the mechanical mixture of the two gases known as producer gas, or uncarburretted water gas having a very high calorific value. The knowledge of this fact has led to many attempts to produce such a gas for illuminating and heating purposes, but the difficulties are great. The principal difficulty is that neither of

the reactions alluded to is spontaneous, for in both heat is absorbed, which must, in some way or other, be supplied. Two methods have been used. In the first the coal is raised to the necessary temperature of incandescence by an air blast through the carbon which is in the form of anthracite coal or coke. Steam is then passed in until the temperature falls below that of incandescence, when the air blast is renewed and the process is repeatedly alternated. In the second method the steam is mixed with a sufficient amount of air to keep the carbon at the requisite temperature, the process being by this expedient made continuous.

In the Lowe process, which has been looked upon as the type for more than a quarter of a century, the first method was used. The plant operated under this process may be described as follows: A cylindrical iron retort, lined with firebrick, is filled, or nearly filled, with coke. Air is blown in through the bottom and the carbon raised to the requisite temperature. When this is reached the supply of air is cut off and a current of steam introduced, which in passing over the coke is broken up, the resulting gases, carbon monoxide and hydrogen, being drawn off at the bottom. Thus, for instance, twelve pounds of carbon will dissociate eighteen pounds of steam, liberating two pounds of hydrogen and forming twenty-eight pounds of carbon monoxide. This means that the composition of the resulting gas will be: by weight, hydrogen 6.67 per cent., carbon monoxide 93.33 per cent., and by volume, since hydrogen is much lighter, hydrogen 50 per cent., carbon monoxide 50 per cent. Or if we take a pound of carbon instead of sixteen pounds, we shall form two and one-third pounds of carbon monoxide and one-sixth of a pound of hydrogen from the decomposition of one and one-half pounds of steam.

Now one pound of carbon in uniting one and one-third pounds of oxygen will evolve 4,300 British Thermal units of heat, a British Thermal unit being the amount of heat requisite to raise one pound of water one degree Fahrenheit. But the separation of the one-sixth of a pound of hydrogen from the oxygen with which it was combined will absorb about 8,700 B. T. U. (British Thermal units), so that in the complete reaction 4,400 units of heat are absorbed, which must be supplied, as well as the loss of heat suffered by radiation and otherwise. If, however, the carbon could be burned in the heating-up stage to carbon dioxide, each pound of carbon would evolve 14,540 units of heat, or more than three times as much as when the carbon is burned to carbon monoxide, and there would be a gain in heat instead of a deficit.

In the Lowe process the carbon was burned to carbon monoxide only. In this lay its great defect, for the yield of water gas was

only 36,000 cubic feet per ton, and about two-thirds of the coke was burned during the heating-up stage, while the products of this first combustion were in most cases useless. In the *Engineering Magazine* for November of last year (1903) a process is described by Mr. A. Humboldt Sexton, called the Dellwik-Fleischer process after its originators.

In this process the carbon in the heating-up stage is burned to carbon dioxide. This is effected by using a thin layer of coke, so that the quantity of oxygen present may be more than enough to oxidize the carbon to carbon dioxide. The results of this simple expedient are very remarkable and can best be seen from a few comparative figures. In the Lowe process the heating-up stage took usually about ten minutes and the actual gas-making lasted about four minutes; in the Dellwik-Fleischer process the former consumes only two or three minutes and the gas-making blow lasts eight or ten minutes. The quantity of water gas obtained from every pound of fuel is almost double, consequently the heating power of the gas from a given weight of fuel will be much larger, while the products of the heating-up combustion will be of small value, being mainly nitrogen and carbon dioxide.

The gas burns with a pale blue flame and so cannot be used for illuminating purposes until it is mixed with the vapor of some one of the hydrocarbons in a carbureter. It is more poisonous than coal gas and more dangerous because inodorous. Its greatest use is in internal combustion motors. Here its high calorific value and almost complete combustion will render it very valuable.

ELECTRIC TRACTION.

Among the many applications of electricity to the service of man, that of propelling street cars is, on account of its recent enormous development, the most impressive. As the system of electric traction has already acquired and developed a large traffic on interurban lines of from fifty to one hundred miles in length, and as lower fares has helped these lines to draw traffic from the steam railways, the question of how much further the electric system will encroach upon the traffic of the steam railways is of present interest. Notwithstanding the great development of the electric system it is safe to say that no serious attempt will be made in the next quarter of a century to supersede steam for long distance travel. It seems certain, however, that the adaptability of electric traction will give it an open field for interurban traffic for distances of upwards of

one hundred miles. This will relieve the congestion on steam railways and give an opportunity for higher speeds for long distances on these roads. As a compensation for the local traffic the electric roads will become efficient feeders for the main channels of travel on the steam roads.

The Census Bureau of the United States recently reported the growth of electric tramways. From this report we give the following figures: There are at present in the United States 22,577 miles of electric railway operated by 987 companies, with capital stock at par value and outstanding funded debt amounting to about $2,300,000,000.

The bearing of this application of science to industry on social conditions may be partially gathered from the fact that 133,641 wage earners are employed by the electric roads of the country. The yearly traffic on these roads is put down at about 5,900,000,000. The traction companies are, moreover, the chief customers of the great electric industries that have grown up during the last decade, and they have, moreover, demanded the development of 1,298,000 steam horse-power and 49,000 hydraulic horse-power. For a full realization of what this means in the daily lives of the artisan and laborer and all dependent upon them we must recall the amount of machinery and all kinds of appliances involved in the development of this immense amount of power.

In another quarter also the subject of electric traction is receiving attention. In the hauling of canal boats the horse and the mule still hold their place on the towpath. In Germany a government commission has been investigating the best method of mechanical haulage. From the trials made on the Teltow canal, near Berlin, the most satisfactory results appear to have been obtained from a single-rail electromotive system. In this system the motor takes the current from an overhead wire and hauls the canal boat by a tow line in the usual fashion.

Another form of single-rail road known as the Behr railway is under construction between Liverpool and Manchester, and it is expected that trains will be operated between the two cities at a speed of 110 miles an hour. If this road be successful, it will undoubtedly influence the adoption of electricity for steam roads. One of the greatest objections to the change at present seems to be the great difficulty of accomplishing it without interfering with the existing necessary traffic. Special mono-rail lines could be constructed alongside the existing tracks and express trains run without interfering with the present service. With this supplementary service the whole system could be gradually changed from steam to electric power.

Closely allied with the above transmission of power by means of electricity is its application to the working of the machinery used on docks, in warehouses and under other similar circumstances. Up to a very recent date this field was entirely worked by the perfected hydraulic cranes and hoists of the late Lord Armstrong. As electric power was introduced for the lighting of these places it was but natural to expect that on account of its ready adaptability to the working of the machinery it would be used for that purpose also. Such is the case, and at present electricity is fast coming into use especially in the ports of Continental Europe.

NOTES.

The Magnetic Storm of October 31, 1903.—A great magnetic storm, as a serious disturbance of the distribution of the earth's magnetism is called, passed over the greater part of the globe on October 31 last. It was accompanied by a magnificent display of the aurora borealis, observed, among other places, at New York, Sydney, Australia, Ireland and Scotland. Simultaneously telegraph and telephone lines felt its effect. At one time in the United States one line of wires had 675 volts of electricity in it. This is sufficient to kill a man, and is surely due to the storm, as the wires were unconnected with a battery at the time of which we write. The current induced is, of course, an earth current.

Two reasons have been given for these magnetic phenomena. According to some they are due to the influence of the spots on the sun. These spots are at present approaching a maximum, and on October 31 the disturbed area made its reappearance at the east limb of the sun, coincident with the aurora and magnetic storm. But it appears to some to be merely a coincidence. For we have had large spots with no accompaniment of magnetic disturbance and aurora, and we have had, also, magnetic disturbance and aurora when there was no unusual solar activity. Another explanation is given, and in this the prominences visible at the edge of the sun's disk at all times, with the proper adjustment of apparatus, are held to be the cause of the above-mentioned disturbances on the earth. Since 1870 a practically continuous record has been kept of the appearance of these prominences and of their distribution in solar latitude, and it has been found that when they approach the polar latitude of the sun the number of days of "great" magnetic disturbances on the earth has been more numerous than when they were in lower latitudes. Thus during 1870-1872, 1881-1882, 1892-1894,

when the prominences were around the pole, there occurred sixteen, ten and seven days of "great" magnetic disturbances respectively, while during the intervening periods, 1873-1880, 1883-1891, 1895-1900, there were only two, one and two "great" disturbances respectively. Since 1899 and 1900 the prominences are tending to the higher latitudes of the sun; and lo! here comes a season of "great" magnetic disturbance. It is, at least, a remarkable coincidence, and taken in conjunction with the former ones a much more striking and regular coincidence than that existing between the sun spots and magnetic storms and auroral.

Sun Spots.—Our readers are doubtless aware of the periodicity with which the sun spots attain their maxima and dwindle to their minima. Sometimes from twenty-five to fifty spots are visible on the sun's disk. These gradually decrease in size and number until a period of some weeks occasionally intervenes, when no spot is visible at all. Then they begin to appear again, until a maximum is reached. This is followed by a minimum, the cycle taking ten or eleven years to complete. The year 1901 had a minimum epoch; so astronomers were looking for some indication of the approach of the succeeding maximum. This came in the shape of a great group during October 4-17, 1903, which appeared again, with additions, in November and December. The aggregate length of the group was at times over 130,000 miles. At times the spots were visible to the naked eye through smoked or dark blue or green glass. The theory of their influence on the earth has been referred to.

Mont Pelee's Remarkable Obelisk.—Mont Pelee has been full of surprises to geologists, but nothing has been more surprising nor at the same time more inexplicable than the huge obelisk of stone obtruded through an opening in the crater since the terrible eruption of May, 1902. In October, 1902, its top was 295 feet above the rim of the old crater. It rose and fell continuously, the top being broken off by explosion and then this lost height being regained in a subsequent obtrusion. The gains exceeded the losses finally, until in March, 1903, the obelisk had an altitude of 5,143 feet above sea level, or 1,174 above the rim of the crater at its highest point. By the middle of August it had lost 574 feet of this height. By the end of the month it had regained 462 feet of this loss. During September it decreased 20 feet, being at the end of the month 1,042 feet in height above the rim and 5,011 feet above sea level. To explain this phenomenon one theory has it that it was a gigantic plug of rock stopping the vent, caused by solidified lava from a former eruption, and which the later activity of Pelee

helped to release. It is significant that the northeast side is fairly smooth and presents a face vertically grooved as if by friction against the sides of the vent. Its texture is, as far as can be judged, pumiceous, and its color is a reddish brown on the northeast side with a whitish encrustation, while on the southwest side, where fresh surfaces are constantly exposed by fractures and explosions, it is gray or reddish gray in color. The talus is gradually building up a cone about the base of the obelisk.

Helium from Radium.—Chemists, as well as every one else interested in scientific phenomena, were startled recently when cable despatches brought the news that Sir William Ramsay had announced in a lecture before the London Institution that he had observed that radium has the power of changing into helium, which is, as far as we know, an entirely different element. Radium, it has been found, gives off three different kinds of rays, which have been named respectively the *x-rays*, the *b-rays* and the *j-rays*. Besides these rays it gives off a heavy gas, the radium emanation, which can be collected in a tube and the tube sealed. The spectrum of this gas is an entirely new one, the spectrum of radium. But Sir William Ramsay noticed that after a few days the characteristic yellow line of helium appeared, and that it grew more and more distinct until the spectrum of helium was unmistakably present. It has been calculated that, if the observed rate of change be constant and if, further, helium be the sole substance thrown off, that radium would change entirely into helium in the course of two million years. "What is this," asked Sir William, "but an actual case of the transmutation of one element into another, in which the ancient alchemists believed, when they painfully sought to change lead into gold and incidentally founded the science of modern chemistry?" However this may be, this newly-discovered fact seems to be pregnant with influences on our views of matter and we may be on the verge of some great determination of the constitution of matter which will astonish us. Incidentally it may be remarked that radium has gone up in price ten-fold in the last six months, because the Austrian Government has prohibited any further exportation of the refuse from which radium is refined from the uranium oxide works at Joachimthal, a town of Bohemia. It is now, as a consequence, worth about twenty-seven million dollars a pound avoirdupois. Still quite a luxury!

D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

QUELQUES MOTIFS A'ESPÉRER. Par *l'Abbé Félix Klein*, Professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. Victor Lecoffre, Rue Bonaparte, 90. Paris, 1904, pp. x., 297.

The abnormal condition of religious life in France has long been a perplexing problem to the American student. It seems as difficult to obtain a clear, comprehensive view of the facts as it is to discover the agencies that have brought them about. That in a country teeming with thirty and more millions of Catholics the Church and her educational institutions should be the victim of a most malignant persecution carried on by the small minority of fanatical political officials is a condition of things as difficult to realize as it is to explain. In an able article in the *Quinzaine*, which we quote from the London *Tablet's* Paris correspondent (December 12), M. Fonsegreve confronts the problem: How is it that the electorate which has no desire to be anti-Catholic, has yet under the pretext of anti-clericalism been dragged into putting itself at the service of anti-Catholic direction? This, of course, has been effected through the electoral committees and the representatives those committees have sent to the Chamber. The electorate is made up of two classes, very unequal in size: Conservatives, who cling to the old ways and who preserve a traditional reverence for the ideas represented by the presbytery, the chateau and the great families, and the Liberals, those whose upbringing, surroundings and difficulties have led them to desire complete emancipation from all ties of social guidance. By these last the rich and the noble and the clergy are regarded as the obstacles in the way of their further progress, and thus M. Fonsegreve concludes that "the present struggle is not in its depths a religious struggle, but a struggle between the classes." Were it not so it would not be so active nor so bitter; neither would it manifest so many unseen and such persistent forces. The religious struggle now going on is therefore but the outcome of this deeper struggle of the classes. This diversion of forces, which of themselves were only directed against a social power regarded as hostile to religious institutions, is, he declares, the work of the Freethinkers and Freemasons. He goes on to show how it is that the political expropriation of the classes in France has become complete through their neglect of the serious for the frivolous things of life. And this has reacted to the misfortune of the religious congregations who have been their educators. At the same time he points out that anti-clericalism must soon be a worn-out cry. The mistake of the

government must in the end become plain. When the inevitable day of disillusionment shall come there will be danger of a sudden and serious reaction on the part of the electorate.

M. Fonsegreve's solution, if not perfectly satisfying, is certainly plausible, and coming as it does from one born and brought up in the actual environment and conversant, therefore, with all the factors and circumstances involved, and so eminently equipped for passing judgment on social problems as is that writer, it undoubtedly comes well accredited.

Be the cause or causes, for they certainly are plural, what they may, the no less important question is what remedies may hopefully be applied to the existing evils? It is cheering to read the suggestions offered by so experienced an observer as the Abbé Klein in the volume at hand. He does not, indeed, come forward with a ready-made panacea for his country's religious and social disorders, but he points confidently to certain forces at work within the French nation that give strong assurance of an approaching convalescence. An undoubtedly practical remedy must be the organization of the Catholic forces. That this is being effectually accomplished the writer has set himself to demonstrate in his opening chapter. He tells here of the Association of Young Catholics, an organization which has spread throughout all France and is doing most practical work in leavening the masses with sound principles, moral, social and political; of the beneficial activity of certain French reviews, notably *le Sillon*, which is the official organ of the association and the radiating centre of its social and religious endeavors; of the "circles of study" and the popular institutes—outreaching organs of the association for propagandizing its ideas amongst the people—a movement somewhat similar to the university extension work in this country. That its activity may not be impeded by rowdy assault from the anti-clericals, the Association has developed what is known as *La Jeune Garde*, an organization of lusty young fellows endowed with the chivalresque spirit of the ancient knight, whose mission it is: 1, to maintain order in the reunions organized by *le Sillon* and the popular institutes and in general by the groups of Catholic social activity; 2, to accompany and protect the Catholic speakers in the public and hostile reunions organized by the anti-clericals.

The author describes these organizations of Catholic forces with infectious enthusiasm and yet with a sense of firm reserve that gives one confidence that there is indeed in what he describes a real *motif d'espérer*. Other motives for hoping the better things for his country he discerns in the manifestly growing appreciative sense of the Gospel principles evidenced by the multiplication of

books treating of our Lord's life. Another reason to hope he sees in the increasing zeal amongst the Bishops and priests for advance in the intellectual training of the clergy. Still another in the recent return to the life work and apostolic spirit of Pére Gratry.

The remaining essays, though dealing with subjects that are for the most part predominantly literary, are permeated with a philosophico-ethical and religious tendency that connects them more or less closely with the central idea—the grounds for hope in the present crisis. Surveying these grounds as a whole one finds them all varying forms of the main thought, that the healing forces now at work in France are acting on the mind of the people, illumining, uplifting, inspiring to higher ethical and social ideals. That such forces are most salutary, reaching as they do the deepest principles of conduct, no one can question, and studied in the glow of fervor and æsthetic form in which the author presents them they seem particularly potent. At the same time to us who view the situation from without it would seem that something more external is demanded—the organization of the people on political lines. The anti-religious war is successful through its political machinery and by political counter agencies it apparently should be met. Political agitation and political organization one would think essential to supplement the ethico-social and religious forces now being zealously urged as the Abbé Klein maintains. But of course to judge from without is as unsafe as it is easy. The leaders of thought and action are doubtless the best judges of the evil and of its remedy.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, 1493-1898. Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and their Peoples, their History and Records of the Catholic Missions, as related in contemporaneous Books and Manuscripts, showing the Political, Economic, Commercial and Religious Conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the close of the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the Originals. Vol. VI., 1583-1588. 8vo., pp. 325. Vol. VII., 1588-1591. 8vo., pp. 320. Vol. VIII., 1591-1593. 8vo., pp. 320. The Arthur H. Clarke Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

"The present volume (VI.) covers the period 1583 to 1588 inclusive. At the close of two decades of Spanish occupation in the Philippines the native population is decimated and the Spanish colonists are poor, heavily burdened with taxation and largely non-producing. The islands are but nominally defended by a small, irregular, demoralized force of unpaid soldiers, whose lawlessness and arrogance render them dangerous to their own countrymen and tyrants over the helpless natives. The Audiencia is a costly institution, a burden of which all the people complain. They have other grievances and many needs, which finally impel them to send a special envoy to Spain, to procure relief and aid from the home

government. The documents of this volume contain much valuable information regarding the economic condition of the colony and its commercial relations with China and Mexico respectively. As the Spanish settlers in the Philippines find that they are largely dependent on China for their food, those who are wise see the necessity of encouraging and extending agriculture in the islands; but others are fired with the lust for wealth and conquest and urge upon Felipe II. a scheme for subduing China by force of arms, thus to give Spain the control of the great Oriental world and incidentally to enrich a host of needy Spanish subjects."

This outline includes the contents of Volume VI. pretty completely.

"Important events and changes occur during the four years included in the scope of Volume VII. The Audiencia is suppressed, and in its place is sent a real Governor; the instructions given to him embody many of the reforms demanded by the people through their envoy Sanchez. Expensive and dangerous conspiracies among the natives against the Spaniards are discovered and severely punished. Trade between Nueva Espana and China is beginning and seems to menace the welfare of the Philippine colony. A large immigration of Chinese to the islands has set in and is already seriously effecting economic interests there. The city of Manila, recently destroyed by fire, is being rebuilt, this time mainly with brick and stone."

It is edifying during this period to find the Jesuits, the Franciscans and the Dominicans laboring zealously for the temporal and eternal welfare of the natives and suffering with them at the hands of unworthy Spanish rulers and the wild tribes who are their natural enemies. Some of the documents included in the volume are very valuable, containing information not only on religious matters, but on the social and economic conditions of both Spaniards and natives in the islands.

At this time we are informed that the Dominicans achieved great results among the Chinese, having established a village of Christians. When we allow for the difference of time, place, national temperament and relations of countries, this history contains nothing surprising. The desire for power, wealth and distinction which characterized man from the beginning will continue until the end. In every age and in every country we find this desire existing and spurring men on to new discoveries, new acquisitions, new conquests. In every country also we shall find the same conflicting human elements: the conscientious, the unscrupulous, the disinterested, the selfish, the patriotic, the indifferent, the self-sacrificing, the mercenary.

The student of history should make due allowance for difference of circumstances, keep his prejudices and sympathies well in check, get the right point of view and then look at two epochs which seem to differ widely. We so often forget to remove the beam from our own eye before looking for the mote in the eye of our brother. Small wonder, indeed, that the beam seems to be in the other eye.

THE CANON OF REASON AND VIRTUE (LAO-TZE'S TAO-TEH-KING). Translated from the Chinese by Dr. Paul Carus. Pp. iv., 43. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1903.

PHILOSOPHICAL CLASSICS: ST. ANSELMO OPUSCULA. Translated by Sidney Norton Deane, B. A. Pp. xxxv., 288. Same Publishers, 1903.

The *Tao-Teh* ranks deservedly amongst the Chinese classics; indeed it merits a high place amongst the world's classics. For profound insight into spiritual truth and for practical wisdom in the guidance of life according to unchangeable principles no seer of all the ages surpassed Lao-Tze. Between him and Confucius there is the difference that distinguishes wisdom from science. Lao-Tze was essentially a philosopher, a searcher for the ultimate, the first and the last principles of things, and he had the intuition that reason can see thus far. Confucius was essentially an empiricist; he was satisfied with the surface of things, the present, the temporal; he distrusted reason to know aught else; he was and claimed to be an agnostic. It was his method of thought and conduct that prevailed and that moulded his nation into the mechanical, stereotyped people they are and have ever been since his day. Still, the deeper wisdom of the *Tao-Teh* has been cherished if not practiced, and the world to-day must needs be the better for being the heir of the treasured truths. In the present brochure Dr. Carus has given an excellent and a readable translation of the venerable classic. The booklet is an excerpt from the author's larger work in which the original text is reproduced. For those who are unacquainted with Chinese and have no particular desire to grapple with the difficulties of its mysterious characters the present brochure will suffice to familiarize them with the life-lore of the old philosopher.

Had Lao-Tze lived under the light of Christianity he might have been an Anselm, and had the saintly mediæval philosopher-theologian lived in pre-Christian times he might well have been the author of the *Tao*. It was not to place these two typical thinkers under comparison that Dr. Carus has published simultaneously with the Chinese classic the Christian classics of St. Anselm. Such a comparison might indeed be instituted with a view to showing how vastly broader and deeper is the wisdom that is informed by

the higher light of Christianity than that which emanated from the mind of the pagan philosopher. But this would carry us too far afield. Suffice it to say that Dr. Carus has put forth these opuscula of St. Anselm as typical of scholastic philosophy wherein reason and faith combine in building a synthetic world-view. The volume contains the "Monologue," the "Prosologue" and the "Cur Deus Homo" and as an appendix the well-known opuscule entitled "In Behalf of the Fool," an answer to St. Anselm's argument in the "Prosologue" by Gaunilon, a monk of Marmoutier. The introduction on St. Anselm's philosophy is reprinted from Weber's "History of Philosophy" and is on the whole fair. The student would do well to supplement its reading by reference to Turner's or Stöckl's "History of Philosophy" (English translation), or Willmann's "Geschichte des Idealismus" (Vol. II.). The introduction contains likewise a number of quotations concerning St. Anselm's "Ontological Argument"—from Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Leibnitz, Kant, Hegel, Dorner, Lotze and Flint. The translators have done their part, which was an extremely difficult one, with remarkable felicity. So far as the reviewer has had time to examine, the rendering is faithful. Besides it is smooth, strong and idiomatic English, retaining just enough of the quaint flavor of the original to make it piquant. Dr. Carus has published some books for which we would not care to be responsible, but these two, the "Tao-Teh King" and the "Opuscula of St. Anselm," we can recommend with all earnestness.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY. By *Very Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, S. T. D., J. U. L.*, Professor of Church History in the Catholic University, Washington. 8vo., pp. viii., 445. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The studies and discourses contained in this volume deal with some general conditions of Christian life in the first three centuries of our era. They have been printed before in different periodicals, and although they do not form a consecutive and complete series they have a certain unity of doctrine, purpose and interest. They illustrate certain phases of the centuries before Constantine; hence the title which is, strictly speaking, the title of the first paper, but may in a more general sense be applied to the whole book. The author begins with a sketch of the earliest history of the Church, and particularly the period of her foundation by the apostles and their successors. This is naturally followed by a study of St. Paul, his character, conversion and labors. Then we are introduced to St. Clement III., successor of St. Peter and head of the Church from A. D. 81 to 96, as he is made known to us through his invaluable Epistle to the Corinthians.

In the next chapter we have a picture of the martyrs of Lyons and Vienna who won their crowns during the persecution under Marcus Aurelius, A. D. 161-180. The story is unusually graphic, being told by one of themselves in a letter to the churches of Asia Minor.

Under the title "Slavery and Free Labor in Pagan Rome" we have a striking picture of the conditions which prevailed when, out of one and a half million inhabitants, fully seven to eight hundred thousand were slaves, and of the remaining half, perhaps four hundred thousand formed the proletariat, the poor but free inhabitants of the city, most of them living by crooked and shameful means.

A paper on "The Origin of Christmas" has an interest that is world-wide, and which, like the feast itself, is lasting.

The next two chapters will appeal most strongly to women, for they deal with her condition in early Christian communities and in pagan antiquity.

These are followed quite appropriately by a sermon on the gentle Agnes, who gave up her young life for the faith at a time when pagan Rome had begun to totter and whose sweet memory remains green after sixteen hundred years.

"The Church and the Empire" deals with the period between A. D. 250 and 312 in the West and in the Orient, and shows the constituents of Christian society and the causes of the rapid spread of Christianity.

Under the title "A Christian Pompeii" the author treats in a delightful manner of the ruins of some of the ancient cities and towns of Syria, and then takes his readers into "Roman Africa."

The book closes with a paper on John Baptist De Rossi, the Columbus of the Catacombs.

These subjects are all interesting and instructive, but their treatment by Dr. Shahan lends a new charm to them. He is so eminently fitted in every way for work of this kind that too much cannot be said by way of praise and encouragement. We realize that his duties at the University occupy his time very fully and that his literary work is done in odd moments, but we trust that he will be able to continue these delightful and valuable studies.

THE TWO KENRICKS: Most Rev. Francis Patrick, Archbishop of Baltimore; Most Rev. Peter Richard, Archbishop of St. Louis. By *John J. O'Shea.* With an introduction by Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia. 8vo., pp. xv.—495, with portraits. Philadelphia: John J. McVey.

This is one of the most important contributions to American ecclesiastical history that has come from the press up to the present

time. We have had general histories of the Church in this country, but they have been necessarily brief because of the enormous territory to be covered, the rapidly changing conditions, the difficulty of gathering material and comparative newness of things. We have had good histories of parishes, and dioceses, and provinces, more or less interesting and important, according to the time and place with which they deal. We have also had excellent biographies of prominent churchmen, who have labored with zeal and honor for the glory of God in the American Church. But the two Kenricks have filled so large a space in this field, and have labored so long and so successfully, that they are intimately connected with the events of three-quarters of a century.

From the time that Francis Patrick took his place in the chair of dogmatic theology in the Seminary at Bardstown, in 1820, until Peter Richard closed his eyes in death as Archbishop of St. Louis, in 1896, the two brothers were striking figures in the Catholic Church of America. The elder brother, passing successfully through storm and persecution in the Episcopal See of Philadelphia, was transferred to the more ancient Archiepiscopate of Baltimore. The younger brother, after discharging faithfully the offices of rector of the Seminary and Vicar General in Philadelphia, was transferred to St. Louis, where he spent the remainder of his days.

Both were distinguished for piety and learning; both were wise rulers; both were exceptional authors; both occupied central sees in a growing Church which expanded about them in every direction; both were active and successful in training others for the episcopal office, and both exercised a strong influence in the appointment of candidates to new or vacant sees. Therefore their power was felt far beyond the confines of the districts over which they presided and lasted long after they had passed away, and still continues.

Our readers will probably share our regret that this book was not written by the one man who is best fitted in every way to be its author, Most Rev. Archbishop Ryan. The Archbishop himself regrets his inability to act in this capacity. He had hoped for years to discharge this labor of love, and only yielded the place which rightly belonged to him to another when he found that advancing years, with increasing rather than diminishing calls on his time, forbade him longer to hope.

The author was singularly fortunate in his resources. He not only had access to the archives of Philadelphia, Baltimore and St. Louis, but he also had the inestimable advantage of intercourse with living witnesses, and especially with the Archbishop of Philadelphia, who for thirty-five years was intimately connected with

Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, and through him with his brother, of Baltimore.

SCIENCE ET RELIGION. Etudes pour les temps present: Les Persecutions et la Critique Moderne. Par *M. Paul Allard*, p. 62.

LES CHRÉTIENS ONT-ILS INCENDIÉ ROME SOUS NÉRON? Par *M. Paul Allard*, p. 62. Paris: Bloud et Cie, 4 Rue Madame, 1904.

One who judges of the politico-religious condition of France at the present day from the outside would probably find a reason for hope of betterment in the zeal for the spread of apologetic literature manifest in the products of the Catholic press in that country. To mention just one out of many such evidences, there is the series of short studies appearing under the general title of the two brochures at hand. Begun some few years ago the series now runs up to at least two hundred and sixty-six numbers. The little volumes, handy in shape, neat in dress and type, cover almost every variety of subject bearing on religion from a scientific and historical standpoint. Like the publications of the London Truth Society they are solid in matter and well written, and yet withal popular. Emanating largely from writers of recognized authority on the corresponding subjects, they are thus secured from unproven assertions and vague generalities. What is not without its hopeful significance is that a goodly proportion of the numbers are written by laymen. Surely a people in which there is a laity that produces and it may be safely inferred a laity that reads apologetic literature of this kind cannot be on the verge of infidelity nor steeped in immorality, as the French are sometimes said to be.

As regards the two opuscles here presented it suffices to note that both are from the pen of M. Paul Allard, than whom no recent writer speaks with more authority on the condition of Christianity in the early centuries. His various works dealing with that period have taken their place amongst the recognized classics of modern historical criticism.

The first of the two brochures at hand discusses briefly the bearing of modern criticism on the persecutions of the early Christians and shows that whilst the new methods place an interrogation point after some of the legends of the martyrs, they have in no wise weakened the incomparable fact of martyrdom as an apologetic argument.

The second booklet deals with the theory devised by a recent Italian writer that the burning of Rome under Nero was the work of the Christians. M. Allard, after a careful examination of the data, reaches the conclusion that the problem concerning the origin

of the conflagration will probably never be settled. Of the contemporaries some attribute it to accident, others to Nero. Tacitus indicates both hypotheses. After him the culpability of Nero seems to have been accepted by the people and the historians. The idea of the accountability of the Christians occurred to no ancient writer, pagan or believer. The notion was born in our own day. So long, therefore, as no ancient testimony is produced to give it consistency M. Allard rightly deems it the duty of the historian to hold it of no account.

ETUDES BIBLIQUES: Questions d'Ecriture Sainte. Par *Ch. P. Grannan, Ph. D., D. D.*, Professeur a l'Université Catholique de Washington. Traduit de l'Anglais par l'Abbé L. Collin, D. D., Professeur a l'École St François de Sales a Dijon. Paris: P. Lethielleux, pp. 208.

It may be taken as an indication of the permanent value of Dr. Grannan's Biblical Studies that they have passed into the French language, which is already so rich in kindred works, and also, we are told, into Italian, though the latter translation has not as yet been published. The collection of essays translated by Dr. Collin appeared originally as articles in this REVIEW and in the *Catholic University Bulletin*. It will doubtless gratify many readers to find them in the convenient shape given them in the present neat little volume. There are in all five essays. The first on a programme of Biblical studies was suggested by the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus." It offers a very clear and comprehensive outline of the scope of Biblical introduction, exegesis and the connected sciences. The second paper, treating of the Higher Criticism and the Bible, is a judicious study of a subject that has now passed from the library into the magazine and newspaper and thence into the popular consciousness, where it has become enveloped in no little obscurity and confusion. The author distinguishes clearly between the use and abuse of Biblical Criticism and incidentally alludes to a passage from Hastings in which the following significant figures are taken. The hypotheses put forth by the so-called higher critics during the past fifty years to account for the historical books of the Old Testament number 113; for the poetical books, 108; for the major prophets, 99; for the minor, 144—making for the Old Testament a total of 599. At least 208 have been framed for the various books of the New Testament. Fortunately of the grand total 609 have been weighed and found wanting. Is the remainder reserved for a better fate?

The three concluding chapters treat of the dual element in Holy Scripture, the divine and the human—subjects evidently that require careful handling if undue minimizing and exaggeration of each

factor are to be avoided. It need hardly be said that Dr. Grannan has shown marked firmness of judgment, together with a delicate sense of discernment in his treatment of these matters.

The translator has done his part perfectly. The thoroughly translucent French impedes not one ray of the original, whilst its uniform smoothness makes one forget that he is reading a translation. A very complete analytical table of contents and a double index of matter and authors add not a little to the convenience of the volume. The work could have been made still more useful had the local references to authors quoted in the text been indicated. We might also note that the addition of the figures given on page 76 is somewhat at fault.

HISTORIC HIGHWAYS OF AMERICA. Vol. VI., Boone's Wilderness Road. By *Arthur Butler Hulbert.* With Maps and Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 207. The Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Volume VI. of this very interesting and instructive series certainly does not fall behind its predecessors in value. It deals with "Boone's Wilderness Road," commonly called the "Wilderness Road." It leads into Kentucky from Virginia and Tennessee. It was the longest, blackest, hardest road of pioneer days in America, and it is true to-day to every gloomy description and vile epithet that was ever written or spoken of it. It was broken open for white man's use by Daniel Boone, from the Watanga settlement on the Holston river, Tennessee, to the mouth of Otter creek, on the Kentucky river, in the month preceding the outbreak of open revolution at Lexington and Concord. A wilderness of laurel thickets lay between the Kentucky settlement and Cumberland Gap and was the most desolate country imaginable. The name was transferred to the road that passed through it.

"As in the case of other highways with which this series of monographs is dealing, so with Boone's Wilderness Road: the road itself is of little consequence. The following pages treat of phases of the story of the West suggested by Boone's Road—the first social movement into the lower Ohio Valley, Henderson's Transylvania Company, the struggle of the Watanga settlement to prevent the Southern Indians from cutting Kentucky off from the world, the struggle of the Kentucky settlements against the British and their Indian allies, the burst of population over Boone's Road into Kentucky and what the early founding of that commonwealth meant to the East and to the West."

This outline suggests clearly the interest of the book. It also indicates the vividness with which facts are presented. The mere story of the building of a road would be as dry as the road itself on

an August day, but when we are invited to travel over it in the company of those who made it, and when we walk in the footsteps of those who pushed civilization before them along it, overcoming every obstacle, the story lives and moves and is enacted anew before our eyes.

SALVAGE FROM THE WRECK. A Few Memories of Friends Departed Preserved in Funeral Discources. By *Father Gallwey, S. J.* New Edition, Enlarged. 12mo., pp. xxvi., 427. London: Art and Book Co.

We shall begin our notice of this book with the author's P. S. which appears at the end of his introduction: "I have said that it is in deference to the advice of three friends that I publish this volume." We are quite sure that every reader of the book will say that they were wise friends without being informed that their names were Lady Georgiana Fullerton, Rev. Henry Coleridge, S. J., and Rev. Father Russell, S. J. We are quite sure also that every one who reads the book will wish that more had been saved from the wreck.

It is a collection of fourteen funeral sermons, a few biographic sketches and two centenary sermons. Generally we do not approve of the publication of books of sermons, and we have said so in tones not altogether mild in the pages of this REVIEW on more than one occasion; therefore we are more than glad to welcome this book as the exception. Such an abundance of beautiful thoughts, so nicely worded and so aptly illustrated with quotations from Holy Writ, has never come under our notice before. No one else can preach these sermons because Father Gallney has a distinct personality which no one else can assume or imitate, and all that he says or writes is his own in a much stricter sense than can generally be said of the writings and sayings of others. But his beautiful thoughts can be studied and his style and industry imitated and great profit will surely follow for preacher and hearer.

PROBLEMS AND PERSONS. By *Wilfrid Ward*, author of "William George Ward and the Oxford Movement," "The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman," etc. 8vo., pp. 430. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

A collection of eleven essays, most of which have appeared in the leading reviews in the course of the past eight years. They are reproduced with additions and alterations, and are brought into accord with the present time as to persons and facts. Three of them have not appeared before under the author's name; one of them, on the "Life Work of Cardinal Wiseman," is published for the first time. The other subjects are: "The Time-Spirit of the Nine-

teenth Century," "The Rigidity of Rome," "Unchanging Dogma and Changeful Man," "The Foundations of Belief," "Candor in Biography," "Tennyson," "Thomas Henry Huxley," "Two Mottoes of Cardinal Newman," "Newman and Renan," "The Life of Mrs. Augustus Craven."

These subjects speak for themselves, and it were superfluous for us to dwell on Mr. Ward's treatment of them. His reputation for all that is excellent as an essayist, historian and biographer is beyond question.

The Analytical Summary prefixed to the volume is a fine example of such work, giving in brief form the substance of each essay. The book is made in the best manner as to type and paper, being quite up to the standard of Longmans, Green & Co., whose imprint is always a guarantee of good form.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. By *William Turner, S. T. D.* Boston and London: Ginn & Co.

JESUIT EDUCATION: Its History and Principles viewed in the light of Modern Educational Problems. By *Robert Schwickerath, S. J.* St. Louis: B. Herder. $1.75 net.

Here are two excellent books which we can unreservedly commend to all those who are interested in the problems of pedagogy. We have no doubt that they will win their way to general recognition as authoritative statements of the Catholic position in their respective spheres. We do not anticipate that they will put an immediate end to the inveterate slanders of non-Catholic writers; but if those whom it concerns see to it that copies of these admirable handbooks be placed in all the public libraries of the country, they will furnish an efficacious antidote to the virus of Compayre and his colleagues, who are doing their utmost to poison the minds of our countrymen by infecting with contempt for everything Catholic the most influential of all classes, the teachers in our public schools. We congratulate Dr. Turner and Father Schwickerath on the thoroughness and ability of their work, and trust that they will not allow their pens to rust. The Catholic writers ought not to rest until they have furnished us with a complete pedagogical library written in the same Catholic spirit which pervades the pages of these books.

A HISTORY OF ENGLAND FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS. By *E. Wyatt-Davies, M. A.*, Trinity College, Cambridge. With fourteen maps in the text. 12mo., pp. xv., 539. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This manual has been made to supply the need of a text-book of

English history for the middle and upper divisions of school, which, while giving a narrative of political events, should at the same time emphasize matters of special interest to Catholics. It is well to note, however, that the book is a political, not an ecclesiastical history. At the same time it is also worthy of note that while the author endeavors to avoid a controversial tone when touching on religious questions, and while he tries to present a fair statement of facts at all times, yet he does view things from the Catholic point. This is entirely lawful and he is accompanied by reputable Protestant authors at every point.

The book is an excellent example of a good compendium. Most summaries are very dry, like bones without flesh, but Mr. Davies has the power of clothing brief statements with interest. The book fills a long-felt want and should have a large sale.

THE SPIRITUAL CONFLICT AND CONQUEST. By *Dom J. Castaniza, O. S. B.* Edited with Preface and Notes by the Very Rev. Jerome Vaughan, O. S. B. Reprinted from the Old English Translation of 1562. Third Edition. 12mo., pp. lxx., 510. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Here is an old friend in a new dress, and it is hard to believe that the little green 24mo. which has been the constant companion of the incomparable Imitation for so many years on our shelves, is the same book. But so it is except that the new book has been enlarged with valuable notes and much increased in size by improved type and paper.

It is superfluous to speak of the excellencies of the Spiritual Combat, as it is unnecessary to dwell on the value of the Bible and the Imitation. These books form a trinity of sanctity in the library of every saint. Would that we could place them in the hands of every sinner. There is a sweetness, a consolation about the "Spiritual Conflict" which must be experienced, but cannot be described. Those who drink at this well of wisdom realize more and more the vanity of the world.

DE MATRIMONIO. Ad usum Scholarum ex Summa Theologiae moralis exprimendum curavit *H. Noldin, S. J.* Quiponte. Fel. Rauch, pp. 218. Pustet & Co., New York, 1903.

The author of this little book on matrimony has published the tract apart for the convenience of his students in the University of Innsbruck, where he is a professor. Its clear-cut method, variety of letter press and other mechanical devices adapt it particularly to the students' wants. It will serve no less as a handy

instrument of review and reference for the use of the clergy, especially as it brings within brief compass teachings scattered amongst many large works and embodies the late decrees of the Roman Congregations on its subject matter. A note here and there might have enhanced its value for the American student, as, for instance, in connection with the promulgation of the Tridintine decree Tametsi. The localities are indicated for Europe, but not for the United States.

WETZER UND WELTE'S KIRCHEN LEXICON. Namen—und Sachregister Zu allen Zwoelf Baenden. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder. $2.45 net.

With the publication of this volume of indexes the finishing touch has been put to the great Catholic Lexicon of Herder, a work which truly deserves the oft-abused epithets of monumental and epoch-making. We have repeatedly drawn the reader's attention to the importance of this enduring monument of German faith and industry. We should feel crippled without it, as there exists absolutely no substitute for it in any language.

The present volume of indexes is worthy of the main work and greatly facilitates the use of it. The industry of the compiler, who is described as a parish priest of the Archdiocese of Cologne, is truly astounding. The preliminary remarks of Dr. Abfalter, "How to use the Lexicon," are judicious and suggestive.

DIVINE GRACE. A Series of Instructions arranged according to the Baltimore Catechism. An aid to Teachers and Preachers. Edited by Rev. Edmund J. Wirth, Ph. D., D. D., Professor of St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y. 12mo., pp. 330. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"These instructions on divine grace are intended as a help to the teacher and the catechist in explaining the doctrine of the Church on this important subject." The author adds that his aim has been to give in simple language as full an exposition of the doctrine of grace as possible under the circumstances. He has succeeded admirably: in simplicity of language, clearness of expression and aptness of illustration the book is a model. It possesses the rare quality of appealing to the trained theologian and the amateur. Few writers are able to make so subtle a subject so intelligible.

THE GREEN SATIN GOWN. By *Laura E. Richards.* Illustrated by Etheldred B. Barry. 12mo., pp. 225. Boston: Dana, Estes & Co.

This volume contains seven short stories in Miss Richards' happiest style. She is always bright and interesting and there is a vividness about all that she writes which is characteristic. Add to

this that her stories point a moral without preaching it, and you must admit that her books are worth having.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: Apparitions, Revelations, Graces. By *Bernard St. John.* 12mo., pp. 486. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

TOWARDS ETERNITY. By the *Abbé Poulin.* Translated by M. T. Torromé. 12mo., pp. 328. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Bros.

MORAL BRIEFS. A Concise, Reasoned and Popular Exposition of Catholic Morals. By the *Rev. John H. Stapleton.* 12mo., pp. 311. Hartford: The Catholic Transcript.

MISTAKES AND MISSTATEMENTS OF MYERS; or, Notes on Myer's Mediæval and Modern History. By *Rev. William E. Randall.* 12mo., pp. 350. Columbia, Ohio: Sacred Heart Church.

THE INNER LIFE OF THE SOUL. Short Spiritual Messages for the Ecclesiastical Year. By *S. L. Emery.* 12mo., pp. 273. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

THE RIGHT TO LIFE OF THE UNBORN CHILD. A Controversy between Professor Hector Treub, M. D., Rev. R. Van Oppenraay, S. J., and Professor Th. M. Vlaming, M. D. 12mo., pp. 125. New York: Joseph F. Wagner.

SKETCHES FOR SERMONS, chiefly on the Gospels, for the Sundays and Holy Days of the year. By *Rev. R. K. Wakeham, S. S.*, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y. 12mo., pp. 229. New York: Joseph F. Wagner.

IRISH-AMERICAN HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. By *Very Rev. John Canon O'Hanlon, M. R. I. A.* Quarto, pp. 765. Illustrated. Dublin: Sealy, Byers & Walker.

A NEW DISCOVERY OF A VAST COUNTRY IN AMERICA. By *Father Louis Hennepin.* Reprinted from the second London issue of 1698, with facsimiles of original title-pages, maps and illustrations, and the addition of Introduction, Notes and Index by Reuben Gold Thwaites, Editor of "The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. In two volumes, square 8vo., pp. 710. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co.

HISTORY OF IRELAND, in three volumes. By *Rev. E. A. D'Alton, C. C.*, with Preface by Most Rev. John Healy, D. D., Archbishop of Tuam. Vol. I., 8vo., pp. 460. From the Earliest Times to 1547. Dublin: Sealy, Byers & Walker.

READING AND THE MIND WITH SOMETHING TO READ. By *Rev. J. F. X. O'Conor, S. J.* Sixth Edition revised and enlarged. 12mo., pp. 209. Philadelphia: John J. McVey.

FICTION FROM BENZIGER BROTHERS, NEW YORK:

HEARTS OF GOLD. By *I. Edhor.* Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 234.

SAINT CUTHBERT'S. By *Rev. J. E. Copus, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 245.

CARROLL DARE. By *Mary T. Waggaman.* 12mo., pp. 161. Illustrated.

NEW PUBLICATIONS OF GINN & CO., BOSTON:

THE CORONA SONG BOOK. A choice Collection of Choruses designed for the use of High Schools, Grammar Schools, Academies and Seminaries. Comprising Part Songs and Choruses, Oratorio Selections, Selected Hymns and Tunes, National and Patriotic Songs. Selected, Compiled and Arranged by William C. Hoff, Director of Music in the Public Schools of Yonkers, N. Y. Quarto, pp. 362. Price, $1.00. By mail, $1.20.

TENNYSON'S POEMS. Edited by Henry Van Dyke Murray, Professor of English Literature in Princeton University. 12mo., pp. 490. Price, 90 cents. By mail, $1.00.

THE SHIP OF STATE. By those at the Helm. 12mo., pp. 264.

LESSONS IN PHYSICS. By *Lothrop D. Higgins, Ph. B.*, Instructor in Natural Science in the Morgan School, Clinton, Conn. 12mo., pp. 379. Illustrated. Price, 90 cents.

GEOGRAPHICAL INFLUENCES IN AMERICAN HISTORY. By *Albert Perry Bingham,* Professor of Geology in Colgate University. 12mo., pp. 366. Illustrated. Price, $1.25. By mail, $1.40.

STORIES OF THE ANCIENT GREEKS. By *Charles D. Shaw.* 12mo., pp. 264. Illustrated. Price, 60 cents. By mail, 70 cents.

A FRENCH READER. Arranged for Beginners in Preparatory Schools and Colleges. By *Fred Davis Aldrich, A. M.*, and *Irving Lysander Foster, A. M.* 16mo., pp. 304. Price, 50 cents. By mail, 55 cents.

MEDIÆVAL AND MODERN HISTORY. Part II. The Modern Age. By *Philip Van Ness Myers.* 12mo., pp. 650.